arXiv:1411.6655v1 [math.DG] 24 Nov 2014

LONG-TIME BEHAVIOR OF 3 DIMENSIONAL RICCI FLOW A: GENERALIZATIONS OF PERELMAN'S LONG-TIME ESTIMATES

RICHARD H BAMLER

Abstract. This is the first of a series of papers on the long-time behavior of 3 dimensional Ricci flows with surgery. In this paper we first fix a notion of Ricci flows with surgery, which will be used in this and the following three papers. Then we review Perelman's long-time estimates and generalize them to the case in which the underlying manifold is allowed to have a boundary. Eventually, making use of Perelman's techniques, we prove new long-time estimates, which hold whenever the metric is sufficiently collapsed.

Contents

1. **Introduction** 2

2. **Introduction to Ricci flows with surgery** 5
   2.1. Definition of Ricci flows with surgery 5
   2.2. Existence of Ricci flows with surgery 9

3. **Perelman's long-time analysis results and certain generalizations** 11
   3.1. Perelman's long-time curvature estimates 11
   3.2. The thick-thin decomposition 28

4. **Long-time estimates under the presence of collapse** 29
   4.1. The goodness property 29
   4.2. Universal covers of Ricci flows with surgery 30
   4.3. Quotients of necks 31
   4.4. Bounded curvature around good points 32
   4.5. Bounded curvature at bounded distance from sufficiently collapsed and good regions 33
   4.6. Curvature control at points that are good relatively to regions whose boundary is geometrically controlled 35
   4.7. Controlled diameter growth of regions whose boundary is sufficiently collapsed and good 37
   4.8. Curvature control in large regions that are locally good everywhere 44

Date: November 26, 2014.

References 46

1. Introduction

In this paper, we first introduce a notion of Ricci flows with surgery, which will be used throughout the whole series of papers (see section 2). We will also mention known existence and extension results for such Ricci flows with surgery. Then we review the long-time estimates of Perelman (cf [Per2]) using our notion of Ricci flows with surgery (see section 3). For future purposes we include in this discussion the case in which the underlying manifold is allowed to be non-compact or have a boundary. The estimates in this more general case are of independent interest. Eventually, we derive new long-time estimates using Perelman's techniques, which hold under certain collapsing conditions (see section 4). Those estimates will be used in [BamD].

In the following we will outline the results of this paper. For a shorter summary we refer to subsection 1.2 of [Bam0], where these results are also explained within the context of the whole series of papers. All results of this paper will be used to describe (3 dimensional) Ricci flows with surgery $\mathcal{M}$ at large times t. For a precise definition of Ricci flows with surgery, we refer to the subsequent section 2. In this introduction we assume for simplicity that $\mathcal{M}$ is non-singular, i.e. that it is given by a smooth family of Riemannian metrics $(g_t)_{t\in[0,\infty)}$ on a 3-manifold M that satisfies the Ricci flow equation $\partial_t g_t = -2\,\mathrm{Ric}_{g_t}$.

Our first two results are generalizations of results of Perelman for the case in which the underlying manifold M is non-compact and/or has a boundary.

Resut I: Non-collapsedness controls curvature (Proposition 3.2, subsection 3.1). This result is a generalization of a celebrated theorem of Perelman. It roughly states the following:

For every $w > 0$ there are constants $\overline{r} = \overline{r}(w) > 0$ and $K = K(w) < \infty$ such that if $(x_0, t_0) \in M \times [0, \infty)$ and $0 < r_0 < \overline{r}\sqrt{t_0}$, then the the following holds: If the time-t_0 volume of the time-t_0 ball $B(x_0, t_0, r_0)$ is greater than wr_0^3 and the time-t_0 sectional curvatures are bounded from below by $-r_0^{-2}$ on this ball, then $|\mathrm{Rm}_{t_0}| < Kr_0^{-2}$ on $B(x_0, t_0, r_0)$.

We will generalize this result to the case in which M is non-compact and/or has a boundary. It will turn out that if the boundary of M stays sufficiently far away from x_0 on a time-interval of the form $[t_0 - \frac{1}{10}r_0^2, t_0]$, then the same estimate holds.

Result II: Bounded curvature at bounded distance from non-collapsed regions (Lemma 3.10, subsection 3.1). This result is a generalization of another result of Perelman, which can be summarized as follows:

For every $A < \infty$ there are constants $\overline{r} = \overline{r}(A) > 0$ and $K = K(A) < \infty$ such that if $(x_0, t_0) \in M \times [0, \infty)$ and $0 < r_0 < \overline{r}\sqrt{t_0}$, then we can make the following conclusion: If $|\mathrm{Rm}_{t_0}| \leq r_0^{-2}$ on the parabolic neighborhood $P(x_0, t_0, r_0, -r_0^2) =$

$B(x_0, t_0, r_0) \times [t_0 - r_0^2, t_0]$, *and* $\mathrm{vol}_{t_0} B(x_0, t_0, r_0) > A^{-1} r_0^3$, *then* $|\mathrm{Rm}_t| < K r_0^{-2}$ *on* $B(x_0, t_0, Ar_0)$.

This result is an ingredient for the proof of result Result I.

The next 5 results characterize the Ricci flow in regions that are collapsed, but that become non-collapsed when we pass to the universal, or a local cover of M. By this we mean the following: Consider the universal cover $\pi : \widetilde{M} \to M$ of M and the pull-backs $\widetilde{g}_t = \pi^* g_t$ of the Riemannian metrics g_t on $\widetilde{M}$. Then $(\widetilde{g}_t)_{t \in [0,\infty)}$ is a solution to the Ricci flow on $\widetilde{M}$. Let $x \in M$ and consider a lift $\widetilde{x} \in \widetilde{M}$ of x. Then the volume of a ball $B^{\widetilde{M}}(\widetilde{x}, t, r)$ around $\widetilde{x}$ in $(\widetilde{M}, \widetilde{g}_t)$ is not smaller than the volume of the corresponding ball $B(x, t, r)$ in (M, g_t). In fact, the restriction

$$\pi|_{B^{\widetilde{M}}(\widetilde{x},t,r)} : B^{\widetilde{M}}(\widetilde{x}, t, r) \to B(x, t, r)$$

is a surjective covering map. Note that the volume of $B^{\widetilde{M}}(\widetilde{x}, t, r)$ can be much larger than that of $B(x, t, r)$, for example if $B(x, t, r)$ collapses along *incompressible* (i.e. π_1-injective) S^1 or T^2-fibers. On the other hand, if this collapse occurs along S^1 or T^2-fibers that are compressible in M, but incompressible in some subset $U \subset M$, then the volume of $B^{\widetilde{M}}(\widetilde{x}, t, r)$ might be comparable to that of $B(x, t, r)$, but the the volume of the ball $B^{\widetilde{U}}(\widetilde{x}', t, r)$ around a lift $\widetilde{x}'$ of x in the universal cover $\widetilde{U} \to U$ of U will be much larger. It can be seen that the volume of $B^{\widetilde{U}}(\widetilde{x}', t, r)$ is monotone in U (with respect to inclusion), the largest volume being achieved if we choose $U = B(x, t, r)$. We refer to subsection 1.2 of [Bam0] for a more elaborate discussion collapsing behaviors.

We will now use the following terminology; for more details see Definition 4.1: For every point $x \in M$ and time $t \geq 0$, we first fix a local scale $\rho(x, t) > 0$, which roughly measures how large the negative sectional curvatures are in a neighborhood around x (for more details see Definition 3.1). Then we call a point $x \in M$ *good* if it is non-collapsed in the universal cover $\widetilde{M}$ of M, i.e. if the volume of $B^{\widetilde{M}}(x, t, \rho(x, t))$ is larger than $c\rho^3(x, t)$ for some uniform $c > 0$. If the ball $B^{\widetilde{U}}(x, t, \rho(x, t))$ is larger than $c\rho^3(x, t)$ for some subset $U \subset M$, then we say that x is *good relatively to* U. Finally, if x is good relatively to $U = B(x, t, \rho(x, t))$, then we call x *locally good*.

We can now state the next 5 results:

Result III: Bounded curvature around good points (Proposition 4.4, subsection 4.4). This result can be summarized as follows:

For every $w > 0$ *there are* $\overline{r} = \overline{r}(w) > 0$ *and* $K = K(w) < \infty$ *such that: For every* $(x_0, t_0) \in M \times [0, \infty)$ *and* $0 < r_0 < \sqrt{t_0}$ *we have: If* $\mathrm{vol}_{t_0} B^{\widetilde{M}}(\widetilde{x}_0, t_0, r_0) > w r_0^3$ *and if the time-*t_0 *sectional curvatures are bounded from below by* $-r_0^{-2}$ *on* $B(x_0, t_0, r_0)$, *then* $|\mathrm{Rm}_{t_0}| < K r_0^{-2}$ *on that ball.*

This result will follow from Result I applied to the universal covering flow $(\widetilde{M}, \widetilde{g}_t)$.

Result IV: Bounded curvature at bounded distance from sufficiently collapsed and good regions (Proposition 4.5, subsection 4.5). This result can be interpreted as a variant of Result II in the collapsed case. It reads:

For every $A < \infty$ there are constants $\overline{w} = \overline{w}(A) > 0$ and $K = K(A) < \infty$ such that for every $(x_0, t_0) \in M \times [0, \infty)$ and $0 < r_0 < \sqrt{t_0}$ we have: If $|\mathrm{Rm}_{t_0}| \leq r_0^{-2}$ on the parabolic neighborhood $P(x_0, t_0, r_0, -r_0^2) = B(x_0, t_0, r_0) \times [t_0 - r_0^2, t_0]$, $\mathrm{vol}_{t_0} B^{\widetilde{M}}(\widetilde{x}_0, t_0, r_0) > A^{-1} r_0^3$ and $\mathrm{vol}_{t_0} B(x_0, t_0, r_0) < \overline{w} r_0^3$, then $|\mathrm{Rm}_{t_0}| < K r_0^{-2}$ on $B(x_0, t_0, A r_0)$.

Note that did not need to assume that $r_0 < \overline{r}\sqrt{t_0}$ for some $\overline{r} = \overline{r}(A) > 0$ as in Result II. This difference will be essential for us. So Result IV is not strictly a generalization of Result II and does not directly follow from Result II by passing to the universal cover. Instead, the proof of this result, makes use of the fact that $B(x_0, t_0, r_0)$ is sufficiently collapsed.

Result V: Curvature control at points that are good relatively to regions whose boundary is geometrically controlled (Proposition 4.6, subsection 4.6). We next consider a subset $U \subset M$ and a point $x_0 \in U$ that is good relatively to U. We then obtain a generalization of the Result III:

For every $w > 0$ there are constants $\overline{r} = \overline{r}(w) > 0$ and $K = K(w) < \infty$ such that: For every $(x_0, t_0) \in M \times [0, \infty)$ and $0 < r_0 < \overline{r}(w)\sqrt{t_0}$ we have: If $B^{\widetilde{U}}(\widetilde{x}_0, t_0, r_0) > w r_0^3$ and the sectional curvatures are bounded from below by $-r_0^{-2}$ on $B(x_0, t_0, r_0)$ and if $|\mathrm{Rm}| < r_0^{-2}$ on $P(x, t_0, r_0, -r_0^2)$ for all $x \in \partial U$, then $|\mathrm{Rm}_{t_0}| < K r_0^{-2}$ on $B(x_0, t_0, r_0)$.

The idea of the proof will be that under these assumptions the boundary of U stays far enough away from x_0 for all times of $[t_0 - r_0^2, t_0]$ if it is far enough away at time t_0. This fact will enable us to localize the arguments in the proof of Result III.

Result VI: Controlled diameter growth of regions whose boundary is sufficiently collapsed and good (Proposition 4.7, subsection 4.7). We will next control the diameter growth of a subset $U \subset M$ under the Ricci flow, only based on geometric control around its boundary and a diameter bound at early times. In rough terms, our statement will be:

For every $A < \infty$ there are $\overline{w} = \overline{w}(A) > 0$ and $A' = A'(A), K = K(A) < \infty$ such that: Assume that $0 < r_0 < \sqrt{t_0}$ and $x_0 \in M$. Assume also that the boundary of U is small enough such that $\partial U \subset B(x_0, t, A r_0)$ for all $t \in [t_0 - r_0^2, t_0]$ and assume that $U \subset B(x_0, t_0 - r_0^2, A r_0)$. Then if $\mathrm{vol}_{t_0} B^{\widetilde{M}}(\widetilde{x}_0, t_0, r_0) > A^{-1} r_0^3$, $\mathrm{vol}_{t_0} B(x_0, t_0, r_0) < \overline{w} r_0^3$ and the sectional curvatures on $B(x_0, t_0, r_0)$ are bounded from below by $-r_0^{-2}$, we have $U \subset B(x_0, t, A' r_0)$ for all $t \in [t_0 - r_0^2, t_0]$. Moreover, $|\mathrm{Rm}| < K r_0^{-2}$ on $U \times [t_0 - r_0^2, t_0]$.

Result VII: Curvature control in large regions that are locally good everywhere (Proposition 4.8, subsection 4.8). In the last result we derive a curvature bound assuming only local goodness. In order to achieve this bound, we must however assume that the local goodness holds in a sufficiently large region and also at earlier times:

For all $w > 0$ there is a constant $K = K(w) < \infty$ such that the following holds: Let $x_0 \in U \subset M$ and $0 < r_0 < \sqrt{t_0}$ and $b > 0$ and assume that $|\mathrm{Rm}| < r_0^{-2}$ on $P(x, t_0, r_0, -r_0^2)$ for all $x \in \partial U$. Assume moreover that for every $t \in [t_0 - r_0^2, t_0]$, $x \in B(x_0, t, b) \cap U$ and every $0 < r < r_0$ for which $B(x, t, r) \subset U$ and for which the sectional curvatures on $B(x_0, t_0, r)$ are bounded from below by $-r^{-2}$ we have

$$\mathrm{vol}_t \widetilde{B^{B(x,t,r)}}(x, t, r) > wr^3.$$

Then $|\mathrm{Rm}_{t_0}| < Kr_0^{-2}$ on $U \cap B(x_0, t_0, b - r_0)$.

We refer to [Bam0] for historical remarks and acknowledgements.

Note that in the following all manifolds are always assumed to be orientable and 3 dimensional, unless stated otherwise.

2. Introduction to Ricci flows with surgery

2.1. **Definition of Ricci flows with surgery.** In this section, we give a precise definition of the Ricci flows with surgery that we are going to analyze subsequently. We will mainly use the language developed in [Bam1] here. In a first step, we define Ricci flows with surgery in a very broad sense. After explaining some useful notions, we will make precise how we assume that the surgeries are performed. This characterization can be found in Definition 2.11. We have chosen a phrasing that unifies most of the common constructions of Ricci flows with surgery, such as those presented in [Per2], [KL1], [MT1], [BBBMP1] and [Bam1]. Hence the main Theorems 1.1 and 1.4 of [BamD] can be applied to the Ricci flows with surgery that were constructed in each of these representations.

Definition 2.1 (Ricci flow with surgery)**.** *Consider a time-interval $I \subset \mathbb{R}$. Let $T^1 < T^2 < \dots$ be times of the interior of I that form a possibly infinite, but discrete subset of $\mathbb{R}$ and divide I into the intervals*

$$I^1 = I \cap (-\infty, T^1), \quad I^2 = [T^1, T^2), \quad I^3 = [T^2, T^3), \quad \dots$$

and $I^{k+1} = I \cap [T^k, \infty)$ if there are only finitely many T^i's and T^k is the last such time and $I^1 = I$ if there are no such times. Consider Ricci flows $(M^1 \times I^1, g_t^1), (M^2 \times I^2, g_t^2), \dots$ on manifolds $M^1, M^2, \dots$ and time-intervals $I^1, I^2, \dots$ (i.e. $\partial_t g_t^i = -2\,\mathrm{Ric}_{g_t^i}$ for each i). Let $\Omega^i \subset M^i$ be open sets on which the metric g_t^i converges smoothly as $t \nearrow T^i$ to some Riemannian metric $g_{T^i}^i$ on Ω_i and let

$$U_-^i \subset \Omega^i \qquad \text{and} \qquad U_+^i \subset M^{i+1}$$

be open subsets such that there are isometries

$$\Phi^i : (U_-^i, g_{T^i}^i) \longrightarrow (U_+^i, g_{T^i}^{i+1}), \qquad (\Phi^i)^* g_{T^i}^{i+1}|_{U_+^i} = g_{T^i}^i|_{U_-^i}.$$

We assume moreover that we never have $U_-^i = \Omega^i = M^i$ and $U_+^i = M^{i+1}$ and that every component of M^{i+1} contains a point of U_+^i. Then, we call $\mathcal{M} = ((T^i), (M^i \times I^i, g_t^i), (\Omega^i), (U_\pm^i), (\Phi^i))$ a Ricci flow with surgery *on the time-interval I and the times $T^1, T^2, \dots$* surgery times*.*

If $t \in I^i$, then $(\mathcal{M}(t), g(t)) = (M^i \times \{t\}, g_t^i)$ is called the time-t slice of $\mathcal{M}$*. The points in $\mathcal{M}(T^i) \setminus U_+^i \times \{T^i\}$ are called* surgery points*. For $t = T^i$, we define*

the (presurgery) time T^{i-}-slice *to be* $(\mathcal{M}(T^{i-}), g(T^{i-})) = (\Omega^i \times \{T^i\}, g^i_{T^i})$. *The points* $\Omega^i \times \{T^i\} \setminus U^i_- \times \{T^i\}$ *are called* presurgery points.

If $\mathcal{M}$ *has no surgery points, then we call* $\mathcal{M}$ non-singular *and write* $\mathcal{M} = M \times I$.

We will often view $\mathcal{M}$ in the *space-time picture*, i.e. we imagine $\mathcal{M}$ as a topological space $\bigcup_{t\in I} \mathcal{M}(t) = \bigcup_i M^i \times I^i$ where the components in the latter union are glued together via the diffeomorphisms Φ^i.

The following vocabulary will prove to be useful when dealing with Ricci flows with surgery:

Definition 2.2 (Ricci flow with surgery, space-time curve)**.** *Consider a sub-interval* $I' \subset I$. *A map* $\gamma : I' \to \bigcup_{t\in I'} \mathcal{M}(t)$ *(also denoted by* $\gamma : I' \to \mathcal{M}$*) is called a* space-time curve *if* $\gamma(t) \in \mathcal{M}(t)$ *for all* $t \in I'$, *if* γ *restricted to each sub-time-interval* I^i *is continuous and if* $\lim_{t \nearrow T^i} \gamma(t) \in U^i_-$ *and* $\gamma(T^i) = \Phi^i(\lim_{t\nearrow T^i} \gamma(t))$ *for all* i.

So a space-time curve is a continuous curve in $\mathcal{M}$ in the space-time picture that is parameterized by the time function.

Definition 2.3 (Ricci flow with surgery, points in time)**.** *For* $(x, t) \in \mathcal{M}$, *consider a spatially constant space-time curve* γ *in* $\mathcal{M}$ *that starts or ends in* (x, t) *and exists forwards or backwards in time for some duration* $\Delta t \in \mathbb{R}$ *and that doesn't hit any (pre- or post-)surgery points except possibly at its endpoints. Then we say that the point* (x, t) survives until time $t + \Delta t$ *and we denote the other endpoint by* $(x, t + \Delta t)$.

Observe that this notion also makes sense, if $(x, t^-) \in \mathcal{M}$ *is a presurgery point and* $\Delta t \leq 0$.

Note that the point $(x, t+\Delta t)$ is only defined if (x, t) survives until time $t+\Delta t$, which entails that $\mathcal{M}$ is defined at time $t + \Delta t$. Using the previous definition, we can define parabolic neighborhoods in $\mathcal{M}$.

Definition 2.4 (Ricci flow with surgery, parabolic neighborhoods)**.** *Let* $(x, t) \in \mathcal{M}$, $r \geq 0$ *and* $\Delta t \in \mathbb{R}$. *Consider the ball* $B = B(x, t, r) \subset \mathcal{M}(t)$. *For each* $(x', t) \in B$ *consider the union* $I^{\Delta t}_{x',t}$ *of all points* $(x', t + t') \in \mathcal{M}$, *which are well-defined in the sense of Definition 2.3 for* $t' \in [0, \Delta t]$ *resp.* $t' \in [\Delta t, 0]$. *Define the* parabolic neighborhood $P(x, t, r, \Delta t) = \bigcup_{x'\in B} I^{\Delta t}_{x',t}$. *We call* $P(x, t, r, \Delta t)$ non-singular *if all points in* $B(x, t, r)$ *survive until time* $t + \Delta t$.

The following notion will be used in section 4 and in [BamD].

Definition 2.5 (sub-Ricci flow with surgery)**.** *Consider a Ricci flow with surgery* $\mathcal{M} = ((T^i), (M^i \times I^i, g^i_t), (\Omega^i), (U^i_\pm), (\Phi^i))$ *on the time-interval* I. *Let* $I' \subset I$ *be a sub-interval and consider the indices* i *for which the intervals* $I'^i = I^i \cap I'$ *are non-empty. For each such* i *consider a submanifold* $M'^i \subset M^i$ *of the same dimension and possibly with boundary. Let* g'^i_t *be the restriction of* g^i_t *onto* $M'^i \times I'^i$ *and set* $\Omega'^i = \Omega^i \cap M'^i$ *and* $U'^{\,i}_- = U^i_- \cap M'^i$ *as well as* $U'^{\,i}_+ = U^i_+ \cap M'^{i+1}$. *Assume that for each* i *for which* I'^i *and* I'^{i+1} *are non-empty, we have* $\Phi^i(U'^{\,i}_-) = U'^{\,i}_+$ *and let* Φ'^i *be the restriction of* Φ^i *to* $U'^{\,i}_-$.

In the case in which $U'^{i}_{-} = \Omega'^{i} = M'^{i}$ *and* $U'^{i}_{+} = M'^{i+1}$ *for some* i*, we can combine the Ricci flows* g'^{i}_{t} *and* g'^{i+1}_{t} *on* $M'^{i} \times I'^{i}$ *and* $M'^{i+1} \times I'^{i+1}$ *to a Ricci flow on the time-interval* $I'^{i} \cup I'^{i+1}$ *and hence remove* i *from the list of indices.*

Then $\mathcal{M}' = ((T'^{i}), (M'^{i} \times I'^{i}, g'^{i}_{t}), (\Omega'^{i}), (U'^{i}_{\pm}), (\Phi'^{i}))$ *is a Ricci flow with surgery in the sense of Definition 2.1.*

Assume that for all $t \in I'$ *the boundary points* $\partial\mathcal{M}'(t) \subset \mathcal{M}(t)$ *(by this we mean all points in* $\mathcal{M}(t)$ *that don't lie in the interior of* $\mathcal{M}'(t)$ *or* $\mathcal{M}(t) \setminus \mathcal{M}'(t)$*) survive until any other time of* I' *and that* $\partial\mathcal{M}'(t)$ *is constant in* t*. Then we call* $\mathcal{M}'$ *a* sub-Ricci flow with surgery *and we write* $\mathcal{M}' \subset \mathcal{M}$*.*

We will now characterize three important local, approximate geometries, which we will frequently be dealing with: ε-necks, strong ε-necks and (ε, E)-caps. The notions below also make sense for presurgery time-slices.

Definition 2.6 (Ricci flow with surgery, ε-necks)**.** *Let* $\varepsilon > 0$ *and consider a Riemannian manifold* (M, g)*. We call an open subset* $U \subset M$ *an* ε*-neck, if there is a diffeomorphism* $\Phi : S^2 \times (-\frac{1}{\varepsilon}, \frac{1}{\varepsilon}) \to U$ *such that there is a* $\lambda > 0$ *with* $\|\lambda^{-2}\Phi^* g(t) - g_{S^2\times\mathbb{R}}\|_{C^{[\varepsilon^{-1}]}} < \varepsilon$*, where* $g_{S^2\times\mathbb{R}}$ *is the standard round metric on* $S^2 \times (-\frac{1}{\varepsilon}, \frac{1}{\varepsilon})$ *of constant scalar curvature* 2*.*

We say that $x \in U$ *is a* center *of* U *if* $x \in \Phi(S^2 \times \{0\})$ *for such a* Φ*.*

If $\mathcal{M}$ *is a Ricci flow with surgery and* $(x, t) \in \mathcal{M}$*, then we say that* (x, t) is a center of an ε-neck *if* (x, t) *is a center of an* ε*-neck in* $\mathcal{M}(t)$*.*

Definition 2.7 (Ricci flow with surgery, strong ε-necks)**.** *Let* $\varepsilon > 0$ *and consider a Ricci flow with surgery* $\mathcal{M}$ *and a time* t_2*. Consider a subset* $U \subset \mathcal{M}(t_2)$ *and assume that all points of* U *survive until some time* $t_1 < t_2$*. Then the subset* $U \times [t_1, t_2] \subset \mathcal{M}$ *is called a* strong ε-neck *if there is a factor* $\lambda > 0$ *such that after parabolically rescaling by* λ^{-1}*, the flow on* $U \times [t_1, t_2]$ *is* ε*-close to the standard flow on* $[-a, 0]$ *for* $a \geq 1$*. By this we mean* $a = \lambda^{-2}(t_2 - t_1) \geq 1$ *and there is a diffeomorphism* $\Phi : S^2 \times (-\frac{1}{\varepsilon}, \frac{1}{\varepsilon}) \to U$ *such that*

$$\|\lambda^{-2}\Phi^* g(\lambda^2 t + t_2) - g_{S^2\times\mathbb{R}}(t)\|_{C^{[\varepsilon^{-1}]}(S^2\times(-\frac{1}{\varepsilon},\frac{1}{\varepsilon})\times[-a,0])} < \varepsilon.$$

Here $(g_{S^2\times\mathbb{R}}(t))_{t\in(-\infty,0]}$ *is the standard Ricci flow on* $S^2 \times \mathbb{R}$ *that has constant scalar curvature* 2 *at time* 0 *and* $\lambda^{-2}\Phi^* g(\lambda^2 t + t_2)$ *denotes the pull-back of the parabolically rescaled flow on* $U \times [t_1, t_2]$*.*

A point $(x, t_2) \in U \times \{t_2\}$ *is called a* center of $U \times [t_1, t_2]$ *if* $(x, t_2) \in \Phi(S^2 \times \{0\} \times \{t_2\})$ *for such a* Φ*.*

Definition 2.8 (Ricci flow with surgery, (ε, E)-caps)**.** *Let* $\varepsilon, E > 0$ *and consider a Riemannian manifold* (M, g) *and an open subset* $U \subset M$*. Suppose that* $(\operatorname{diam} U)^2 |\mathrm{Rm}|(y) < E^2$ *for any* $y \in U$ *and* $E^{-2}|\mathrm{Rm}|(y_1) \leq |\mathrm{Rm}|(y_2) \leq E^2|\mathrm{Rm}|(y_1)$ *for any* $y_1, y_2 \in U$*. Furthermore, assume that* U *is either diffeomorphic to* $\mathbb{B}^3$ *or* $\mathbb{R}P^3 \setminus \overline{\mathbb{B}}^3$ *and that there is a compact set* $K \subset U$ *such that* $U \setminus K$ *is an* ε*-neck.*

Then U *is called an* (ε, E)-cap*. If* $x \in K$ *for such a* K*, then we say that* x *is a* center of U*.*

Analogously as in Definition 2.6, we define (ε, E)-caps in Ricci flows with surgery.

With these concepts at hand we can soon give an exact description of the surgery process that will be assumed to be carried out at each surgery time. To do this, we first fix a geometry that models the metric with which we will endow the filling 3-balls after each surgery.

Definition 2.9 (surgery model)**.** *Consider $M_{\text{stan}} = \mathbb{R}^3$ with its natural $SO(3)$-action and let g_{stan} be a complete metric on M_{stan} such that*

(1) g_{stan} is $SO(3)$-invariant,
(2) g_{stan} has non-negative sectional curvature,
(3) $(M_{\text{stan}}, g_{\text{stan}})$ is isometric to the standard round $S^2 \times (0,\infty)$ of scalar curvature 2, outside of some compact subset.

For every $r > 0$, we denote the r-ball around 0 by $M_{\text{stan}}(r)$.

Let $D_{\text{stan}} > 0$ be a positive number such that the compact subset in (3) is contained in $M_{\text{stan}}(D_{\text{stan}})$. Then we call $(M_{\text{stan}}, g_{\text{stan}}, D_{\text{stan}})$ a surgery model*.*

Definition 2.10 (φ-positive curvature)**.** *We say that a Riemannian metric g on a manifold M has* φ-positive curvature *for $\varphi > 0$ if for every point $x \in M$ there is an $X > 0$ such that $\sec_x \geq -X$ and*

$$\text{scal}_x \geq -\tfrac{3}{2}\varphi \qquad \text{and} \qquad \text{scal}_x \geq 2X(\log(2X) - \log\varphi - 3).$$

Observe that by [Ham, Theorem 4.1] this condition is improved by the Ricci flow in the following sense: If $(M, (g_t)_{t\in[t_0,t_1]})$ is a Ricci flow on a compact 3-manifold with $t_0 > 0$ and g_{t_0} is t_0^{-1}-positive, then the curvature of g_t is t^{-1}-positive for all $t \in [t_0, t_1]$.

Definition 2.11 (Ricci flow with surgery, $\delta(t)$-precise cutoff)**.** *Let $\mathcal{M}$ be a Ricci flow with surgery defined on some time-interval $I \subset [0,\infty)$, let $(M_{\text{stan}}, g_{\text{stan}}, D_{\text{stan}})$ be a surgery model and let $\delta : I \to (0,\infty)$ be a function. We say that $\mathcal{M}$ is* performed by $\delta(t)$-precise cutoff (using the surgery model $(M_{\text{stan}}, g_{\text{stan}}, D_{\text{stan}})$) *if*

(1) For all $t > 0$ the metric $g(t)$ has t^{-1}-positive curvature.
(2) For every surgery time T^i, the subset $\mathcal{M}(T^i) \setminus U^i_+$ is a disjoint union $D^i_1 \cup D^i_2 \cup \dots$ of finitely or countably infinitely many smoothly embedded 3-disks.
(3) For every such D^i_j there is an embedding

$$\Phi^i_j : M_{\text{stan}}(\delta^{-1}(T^i)) \longrightarrow \mathcal{M}(T^i)$$

such that $D^i_j \subset \Phi^i_j(M_{\text{stan}}(D_{\text{stan}}))$ and such that the images $\Phi^i_j(M_{\text{stan}}(\delta^{-1}(T^i)))$ are pairwise disjoint and there are constants $0 < \lambda^i_j \leq \delta(T^i)$ such that

$$\big\|g_{\text{stan}} - (\lambda^i_j)^{-2}(\Phi^i_j)^* g(T^i)\big\|_{C^{[\delta^{-1}(T^i)]}(M_{\text{stan}}(\delta^{-1}(T^i)))} < \delta(T^i).$$

(4) For every such D^i_j, the points on the boundary of U^i_- in $\mathcal{M}(T^{i-})$ corresponding to ∂D^i_j are centers of strong $\delta(T^i)$-necks.

(5) *For every D^i_j for which the boundary component of ∂U^i_- corresponding to the sphere ∂D^i_j bounds a 3-disk component $(D')^i_j$ of $M^i \setminus U^i_-$ (i.e. a "trivial surgery", see below), the following holds: For every $\chi > 0$, there is some $t_\chi < T^i$ such that for all $t \in (t_\chi, T^i)$ there is a $(1+\chi)$-Lipschitz map $\xi : (D')^i_j \to D^i_j$ that corresponds to the identity on the boundary.*

(6) *For every surgery time T^i, the components of $\mathcal{M}(T^{i-}) \setminus U^i_-$ are diffeomorphic to one of the following manifolds: $S^2 \times I$, D^3, $\mathbb{R}P^3 \setminus B^3$, a spherical space form, $S^1 \times S^2$, $\mathbb{R}P^3 \# \mathbb{R}P^3$ and (in the non-compact case) $S^2 \times [0, \infty)$, $S^2 \times \mathbb{R}$, $\mathbb{R}P^3 \setminus \overline{B}^3$.*

We will speak of each D^i_j as a surgery *and if D^i_j satisfies the property described in (5), we call it a* trivial surgery.

If $\delta > 0$ is a number, we say that $\mathcal{M}$ is performed by δ-precise cutoff *if this is true for the constant function $\delta(t) = \delta$.*

Observe that we have phrased the Definition so that if $\mathcal{M}$ is a Ricci flow with surgery that is performed by $\delta(t)$-precise cutoff, it is also performed by $\delta'(t)$-precise cutoff whenever $\delta'(t) \geq \delta(t)$ for all t. Note also that trivial surgeries don't change the topology of the component on which they are performed.

We remark that our notion of "$\delta(t)$-precise cutoff" differs slightly from Perelman's notion of "$\delta(t)$-cutoff" (cf [Per2]). For example, in our picture the surgeries have size $\lesssim \delta(t)$, while in Perelman's construction the size is $\approx h(\delta(t), \delta^2(t) r(t)) < \delta(t) r(t)$, where $r(t)$ is similar to the function $\underline{r}_\varepsilon(t)$ introduced in Proposition 2.15 below. This difference will not become essential.

2.2. **Existence of Ricci flows with surgery.** Ricci flows with surgery and precise cutoff as introduced in Definition 2.11 can indeed be constructed from any given initial metric. We will make this fact more precise in this subsection. To simplify things, we restrict the geometries which we want to consider as initial conditions.

Definition 2.12 (Normalized initial conditions)**.** *We say that a Riemannian 3-manifold (M, g) is* normalized *if*

(1) *M is compact and orientable,*
(2) *$|\mathrm{Rm}| < 1$ everywhere and*
(3) *$\mathrm{vol}\, B(x, 1) > \frac{\omega_3}{2}$ for all $x \in M$, where ω_3 is the volume of a standard Euclidean 3-ball.*

We say that a Ricci flow with surgery $\mathcal{M}$ has normalized initial conditions*, if $\mathcal{M}(0)$ is normalized.*

Any Riemannian metric on a compact and orientable 3-manifold can be rescaled to be normalized. Next, recall

Definition 2.13 (κ-noncollapsedness)**.** *Let $\mathcal{M}$ be a Ricci flow with surgery, $(x, t) \in \mathcal{M}$ and $\kappa, r_0 > 0$. We say that $\mathcal{M}$ is* κ-noncollapsed in (x, t) on scales less than $r_0 > 0$ *if $\mathrm{vol}_t\, B(x, t, r) \geq \kappa r^3$ for all $0 < r < r_0$ for which*

(1) *the ball $B(x, t, r)$ is relatively compact in $\mathcal{M}(t)$,*

(2) the parabolic neighborhood $P(x,t,r,-r^2)$ is non-singular and
(3) $|\mathrm{Rm}| < r^{-2}$ on $P(x,t,r,-r^2)$.

We now introduce a notion of canonical neighborhood assumptions which slightly differs from the notions that can be found in other sources, but which suits better our purposes.

Definition 2.14 (canonical neighborhood assumptions)**.** *Let $\mathcal{M}$ be a Ricci flow with surgery, $(x,t) \in \mathcal{M}$ and $r, \varepsilon, \eta > 0$, $E < \infty$ be constants. We say that (x,t) satisfies the* canoncial neighborhood assumptions *$CNA(r,\varepsilon,E,\eta)$ if either $|\mathrm{Rm}|(x,t) < r^{-2}$ or the following three properties hold:*

(1) (x,t) is a center of a strong ε-neck or an (ε,E)-cap $U \subset \mathcal{M}(t)$,
If $U \approx \mathbb{R}P^3 \setminus \overline{B}^3$, then there is a time $t_1 < t$ such that all points on U survive until time t_1 and such that flow on $U \times [t_1,t]$ lifted to its double cover contains strong ε-necks and both lifts of (x,t) are centers of such strong ε-necks,
(2) $|\nabla|\mathrm{Rm}|^{-1/2}|(x,t) < \eta^{-1}$ and $|\partial_t|\mathrm{Rm}|^{-1}|(x,t) < \eta^{-1}$,
(3) $\mathrm{vol}_t B(x,t,r') > \eta (r')^3$ for all $0 < r' \leq |\mathrm{Rm}|^{-1/2}(x,t)$,

or property (2) holds and the component of $\mathcal{M}(t)$ in which x lies, is closed and the sectional curvatures are positive and E-pinched on this component, i.e. they are contained in an interval of the form $(\lambda, E\lambda)$ for some $\lambda > 0$ (and hence that component is diffeomorphic to a spherical space form).

Note that we have added an additional assumption in the case in which $U \approx \mathbb{R}P^3 \setminus \overline{B}^3$ to ensure that the canonical neighborhood assumptions are stable when taking covers of Ricci flows with surgery (compare with Lemma 4.2). We remark that every manifold that contains a set diffeomorphic to $\mathbb{R}P^3 \setminus \overline{B}^3$, admits a double cover in which this set lifts to a set diffeomorphic to $S^2 \times (0,1)$. So it is possible to verify this extra assumption if all the other canonical neighborhood assumptions hold in any double cover.

The following proposition gives a characterization of regions of high curvature in a Ricci flow with surgery that is performed by precise cutoff. The power of this proposition lies in the fact that none of the parameters depends on the number or the preciseness of the preceding surgeries. Thus, it provides a tool to perform surgeries in a controlled way and hence it can be used to construct long-time existent Ricci flows with surgery as presented in Proposition 2.16 below. The following proposition also plays an important role in the long-time analysis of Ricci flows with surgery that are performed by precise cutoff and will in particular be used in sections 3 and 4 of this paper.

Proposition 2.15 (Canonical Neighborhood Theorem, Ricci flows with surgery)**.** *For every surgery model $(M_{\mathrm{stan}}, g_{\mathrm{stan}}, D_{\mathrm{stan}})$ and every $\varepsilon > 0$ there are constants $\underline{\eta} > 0$ and $\underline{E}_\varepsilon < \infty$ and decreasing continuous positive functions $\underline{r}_\varepsilon, \underline{\delta}_\varepsilon, \underline{\kappa} : [0,\infty) \to (0,\infty)$ such that the following holds:*

Let $\mathcal{M}$ be a Ricci flow with surgery on some time-interval $[0,T)$ that has normalized initial conditions and that is performed by $\underline{\delta}_\varepsilon(t)$-precise cutoff. Then for every $t \in [0,T)$

(a) $\mathcal{M}$ is $\underline{\kappa}(t)$-noncollapsed at scales less than $\sqrt{t}$ at all points of $\mathcal{M}(t)$.
(b) All points of $\mathcal{M}(t)$ satisfy the canonical neighborhood assumptions $CNA(\underline{r}_\varepsilon(t), \varepsilon, \underline{E}_\varepsilon, \underline{\eta})$.

For a proof of this proposition and of Proposition 2.16 see [Per2, sec 5], [KL1, sec 77ff], [MT1, Proposition 17.1, Theorem 15.9], [BBBMP1, Proposition B, Theorem 5.3.1], [Bam1, Theorem 7.5.1]. The following proposition provides us an existence result for Ricci flows with surgery.

Proposition 2.16. *Given a surgery model $(M_{\text{stan}}, g_{\text{stan}}, D_{\text{stan}})$, there is a continuous function $\underline{\delta} : [0,\infty) \to (0,\infty)$ such that if $\delta' : [0,\infty) \to (0,\infty)$ is a continuous function with $\delta'(t) \leq \underline{\delta}(t)$ for all $t \in [0,\infty)$ and (M,g) is a normalized Riemannian manifold, then there is a Ricci flow with surgery $\mathcal{M}$ defined for times $[0,\infty)$ with $\mathcal{M}(0) = (M,g)$ and that is performed by $\delta'(t)$-precise cutoff. (Observe that we can possibly have $\mathcal{M}(t) = \emptyset$ for large t.)*

Moreover, if $\mathcal{M}$ is a Ricci flow with surgery on some time-interval $[0,T)$ that has normalized initial conditions and that is performed by $\underline{\delta}(t)$-precise cutoff, then $\mathcal{M}$ can be extended to a Ricci flow on the time-interval $[0,\infty)$ that is performed by $\delta'(t)$-precise cutoff on the time-interval $[T,\infty)$.

We point out that the functions $\underline{\delta}_\epsilon(t), \underline{r}_\varepsilon(t), \underline{\kappa}(t)$ and the constants $\underline{\eta}, \underline{E}_\varepsilon$ in Proposition 2.15 as well as the function $\underline{\delta}(t)$ in Proposition 2.16 depend on the choice of the surgery model.

From now on we will fix a surgery model $(M_{\text{stan}}, g_{\text{stan}}, D_{\text{stan}})$ for the rest of this and the following three papers and we will not mention this dependence anymore.

3. Perelman's long-time analysis results and certain generalizations

3.1. **Perelman's long-time curvature estimates.** In this subsection, we will review some of Perelman's long-time analysis results (see [Per2]). We will generalize these results to the boundary case and go through most of their proofs. The most important result of this section will be Proposition 3.2 below and will be used in section 4 of this paper. In addition, many of the Lemmas leading to this Proposition will also be used in that section. The boundary case will be important for us, because we want to analyze Ricci flows in local covers.

The following notation will be used throughout the whole paper.

Definition 3.1. *Let (M,g) be a Riemannian manifold and $x \in M$ a point. We define*

$$\rho(x) = \sup\{r \quad : \quad \text{sec} \geq -r^{-2} \ \text{ on } \ B(x,r)\}.$$

For $r_0 > 0$ we set furthermore $\rho_{r_0}(x) = \min\{\rho(x), r_0\}$. If $(M, g) = \mathcal{M}(t)$ is the time-slice of a Ricci flow (with surgery) $\mathcal{M}$, then we often use the notation $\rho(x, t)$ and $\rho_{r_0}(x, t)$.

We also need to use the $\mathcal{L}$-functional as defined in [Per1, sec 7]: For any smooth space-time curve $\gamma : [t_1, t_2] \to \mathcal{M}$ $(t_1 < t_2 \leq t_0)$ in a Ricci flow with surgery $\mathcal{M}$ set

$$\mathcal{L}(\gamma) = \int_{t_1}^{t_2} \sqrt{t_0 - t'}\big(|\gamma'|^2(t') + \mathrm{scal}(\gamma(t'), t')\big)dt'. \tag{3.1}$$

We say that $\mathcal{L}$ is *based in* t_0 and call $\mathcal{L}(\gamma)$ the $\mathcal{L}$-*length* of γ. A curve γ that is a critical point of $\mathcal{L}$ with respect to variations that fix the endpoints is called $\mathcal{L}$-*geodesic*.

We now present the main result of this section. Before we do that we introduce the following convention that we will assume from now on: We will often be dealing with Ricci flows with surgery $\mathcal{M}$ defined on a time-interval of the form $[t_0 - r_0^2, t_0]$ and most results require certain canonical neighborhood assumptions to hold on $\mathcal{M}$. For times that are very close to $t_0 - r_0^2$ this may be problematic since strong ε-necks might stick out of the time-interval. So will will assume from now on that in such a setting $\mathcal{M}$ can be extended backwards to a Ricci flow with surgery $\mathcal{M}' \supset \mathcal{M}$ in which the required canonical neighborhood assumptions hold on the time-interval $[t_0 - r_0^2, t_0]$. In fact, in our applications $\mathcal{M}$ will always arise as such a restriction. Note that we could also resolve this issue by requiring in the assumptions of each of the following results that the canonical neighborhood assumptions hold on a slightly smaller time-interval $[t_0 - 0.99r_0^2, t_0]$.

Proposition 3.2 ([Per2, 6.8] in the non-compact case)**.** *There is a constant $\varepsilon_0 > 0$ such that for all $w, r, \eta > 0$ and $E < \infty$ and $1 \leq A < \infty$ and $m \geq 0$ there are $\tau = \tau(w, A, E, \eta), \overline{r} = \overline{r}(w, A, E, \eta), \widehat{r} = \widehat{r}(w, E, \eta), \delta = \delta(r, w, A, E, \eta, m) > 0$ and $K_m = K_m(w, A, E, \eta), C_1 = C_1(w, A, E, \eta), Z = Z(w, A, E, \eta) < \infty$ such that:*
Let $r_0^2 \leq t_0/2$ and let $\mathcal{M}$ be a Ricci flow with surgery (whose time-slices are allowed to have boundary) on the time-interval $[t_0 - r_0^2, t_0]$ that is performed by δ-precise cutoff and consider a point $x_0 \in \mathcal{M}(t_0)$. Assume that the canonical neighborhood assumptions $CNA(r, \varepsilon_0, E, \eta)$ as described in Definition 2.14 are satisfied on $\mathcal{M}$. We also assume that the curvature on $\mathcal{M}$ is uniformly bounded on compact time-intervals that don't contain surgery times and that all time slices of $\mathcal{M}$ are complete.

In the case in which some time-slices of $\mathcal{M}$ have non-empty boundary, we assume that

- *(i) For all $t_1, t_2 \in [t_0 - \frac{1}{10}r_0^2, t_0]$, $t_1 < t_2$ we have: if some $x \in B(x_0, t_0, r_0)$ survives until time t_2 and $\gamma : [t_1, t_2] \to \mathcal{M}$ is a space-time curve with end-point $\gamma(t_2) \in B(x, t, (A + 3)r_0)$ that meets the boundary $\partial\mathcal{M}$ somewhere, then it has $\mathcal{L}$-length $\mathcal{L}(\gamma) > Zr_0$ ($\mathcal{L}$ being based in t_2, see (3.1)).*
- *(ii) For all $t \in [t_0 - \frac{1}{10}r_0^2, t_0]$ we have: if some $x \in B(x_0, t_0, r_0)$ survives until time t, then $B(x, t, 2(A + 3)r_0 + r)$ does not meet the boundary $\partial\mathcal{M}(t)$.*

Now assume that

(iii) $r_0 \le \overline{r}\sqrt{t_0}$,
(iv) $\sec_{t_0} \ge -r_0^{-2}$ *on* $B(x_0, t_0, r_0)$ *and*
(v) $\operatorname{vol}_{t_0} B(x_0, t_0, r_0) \ge w r_0^3$.

Then $|\nabla^k \operatorname{Rm}| < K_m r_0^{-2-k}$ *on* $B(x_0, t_0, A r_0)$ *for all* $k \le m$. *In particular, if* $r_0 = \rho(x_0, t_0)$, *then* $r_0 > \widehat{r}\sqrt{t_0}$.

If moreover $C_1\delta \le r_0$, *then the parabolic neighborhood* $P(x_0, t_0, A r_0, -\tau r_0^2)$ *is non-singular and we have* $|\nabla^k \operatorname{Rm}| < K_k r_0^{-2-k}$ *on* $P(x_0, t_0, A r_0, -\tau r_0^2)$.

The following Corollary is a consequence of Propositions 3.2 and 2.15.

Corollary 3.3 (cf [Per1, 6.8, 7.3])**.** *There is a continuous positive function* $\delta : [0, \infty) \to (0, \infty)$ *such that for every* $w > 0$, $1 \le A < \infty$ *and* $m \ge 0$ *there are constants* $\tau = \tau(w, A), \overline{\rho} = \overline{\rho}(w, A), \overline{r} = \overline{r}(w, A), c_1 = c_1(w, A) > 0$ *and* $T = T(w, A, m), K_m = K_m(w, A) < \infty$ *such that:*

Let $\mathcal{M}$ *be a Ricci flow with surgery on the time-interval* $[0, \infty)$ *with normalized initial conditions (whose time-slices are all compact) that is performed by* $\delta(t)$*-precise cutoff. Let* $t > T$ *and* $x \in \mathcal{M}(t)$.

(a) If $0 < r \le \min\{\rho(x, t), \overline{r}\sqrt{t}\}$ *and* $\operatorname{vol}_t B(x, t, r) \ge w r^3$, *then* $|\nabla^k \operatorname{Rm}| < K_m r_0^{-2-k}$ *on* $B(x, t, Ar)$ *for all* $k \le m$. *Moreover, if all surgeries on the time-interval* $[t - r^2, t]$ *are performed by* $c_1 r$*-precise cutoff, then the parabolic neighborhood* $P(x, t, Ar, -\tau r^2)$ *is non-singular and we have* $|\nabla^k \operatorname{Rm}| < K_m r^{-2-k}$ *on* $P(x, t, Ar, -\tau r^2)$.

(b) If $\operatorname{vol}_t B(x, t, \rho(x, t)) \ge w\rho^3(x, t)$, *then* $\rho(x, t) > \overline{\rho}\sqrt{t}$ *and the parabolic neighborhood* $P(x, t, A\sqrt{t}, -\tau t)$ *is non-singular and we have* $|\nabla^k \operatorname{Rm}| < K_m t^{-1-k/2}$ *on* $P(x, t, A\sqrt{t}, -\tau t)$.

In the case $A = 1$, this Corollary implies [Per2, 6.8] and parts of [Per2, 7.3].

In the following, we will present proofs of Proposition 3.2 and Corollary 3.3. They require a few rather complicated Lemmas, which we will establish first. The proofs of Proposition 3.2 and Corollary 3.3 can be found at the end of this subsection. Note that the following arguments will be very similar to those presented in [Per2] and [KL1] with small modifications according to the author's taste. Occasionally, we will omit shorter arguments and refer to [KL1]. The main objective in the proofs will be the discussion of the influence of the boundary. Upon the first reading, it is recommended to skip the remainder of this subsection. The boundary case of Proposition 3.2, which is the new result of this subsection, will only be used in subsection 4.6.

The following distance distortion estimates will be used frequently throughout this paper.

Lemma 3.4 (distance distortion estimates)**.** *Let* $(M, (g_t)_{t \in [t_1, t_2]})$ *be a Ricci flow whose time-slices are complete and let* $x_1, x_2 \in M$. *Then*

(a) If $\operatorname{Ric}_t \le K$ *along any minimizing geodesic between* x_1 *and* x_2 *in* (M, g_t), *then at time* t *we have* $\frac{d}{dt^-} \operatorname{dist}_t(x_1, x_2) \ge -K \operatorname{dist}_t(x_1, x_2)$ *in the barrier*

sense. Likewise, if $\mathrm{Ric}_t \geq -K$ *along any such minimizing geodesic, then* $\frac{d}{dt^+}\mathrm{dist}_t(x_1,x_2) \leq K\,\mathrm{dist}_t(x_1,x_2)$ *in the barrier sense.*

(b) If at some time t *we have* $\mathrm{dist}_t(x_1,x_2) \geq 2r$ *and* $\mathrm{Ric}_t \leq r^{-2}$ *on* $B(x_1,r)\cup B(x_2,r)$ *for some* $r>0$*, then* $\frac{d}{dt^-}\mathrm{dist}_t(x_1,x_2) \geq -\frac{16}{3}r^{-1}$ *in the barrier sense.*

Both statements are also true in a Ricci flow with surgery if we can guarantee that all minimizing geodesics between x_1 *and* x_2 *don't intersect surgery points. For example, this condition can be guaranteed if at time* t *the surgeries are performed by* δ*-precise cutoff for some sufficiently small* δ *and if* $|\mathrm{Rm}|(x_1,t) < \frac{1}{2}\delta^{-2}$*.*

Proof. See [KL1, sec 27], [Per1, 8.3], [Bam1, sec 2.3]. The very last statement follows from Defintion 2.11(3). □

We will also need

Lemma 3.5. *Let* $\mathcal{M}$ *be a Ricci flow with surgery that satisfies the canonical neighborhood assumptions* $CNA(r,\varepsilon,E,\eta)$ *for some* $r,\varepsilon,E,\eta>0$*, let* $(x,t)\in\mathcal{M}$ *and set* $Q=|\mathrm{Rm}|(x,t)$*.*

(a) If $Q\leq r^{-2}$*, then* $|\mathrm{Rm}|<2r^{-2}$ *on* $P(x,t,\frac{\eta}{10}r,-\frac{\eta}{10}r^2)$*.*

(b) If $Q\geq r^{-2}$*, then* $|\mathrm{Rm}|<2Q$ *on* $P(x,t,\frac{\eta}{10}Q^{-1/2},-\frac{\eta}{10}Q^{-1})$*.*

Proof. See [Per2, 4.2], [KL1, Lemma 70.1], [Bam1, sec 6.2]. □

We now present the first main Lemma.

Lemma 3.6 (cf [Per2, 6.3(a)])**.** *For any* $1\leq A<\infty$ *and* $w,r,\varepsilon,E,\eta>0$ *there are* $\kappa=\kappa(w,A,\eta),\delta=\delta(w,A,r,\eta)>0$*,* $Z=Z(A)<\infty$ *such that:*
Let $r_0^2<t_0/2$ *and let* $\mathcal{M}$ *be a Ricci flow with surgery (whose time-slices are allowed to have boundary) on the time-interval* $[t_0-r_0^2,t_0]$ *that is performed by* δ*-precise cutoff and consider a point* $x_0\in\mathcal{M}(t_0)$*. Assume that the canonical neighborhood assumptions* $CNA(r,\varepsilon,E,\eta)$ *are satisfied on* $\mathcal{M}$*. We also assume that the curvature on* $\mathcal{M}$ *is uniformly bounded on compact time-intervals which don't contain surgery times and that all time-slices of* $\mathcal{M}$ *are complete.*

Assume that the parabolic neighborhood $P(x_0,t_0,r_0,-r_0^2)$ *is non-singular, that* $|\mathrm{Rm}|\leq r_0^{-2}$ *on* $P(x_0,t_0,r_0,-r_0^2)$ *and* $\mathrm{vol}_{t_0}B(x_0,t_0,r_0)\geq wr_0^3$*.*

In the case in which some time-slices of $\mathcal{M}$ *have non-empty boundary, we assume that*

(i) every space-time curve $\gamma:[t,t_0]\to\mathcal{M}$ *with* $t\in[t_0-r_0^2,t_0)$ *that ends in* $\gamma(t_0)\in B(x_0,t_0,Ar_0)$ *and that meets the boundary* $\partial\mathcal{M}(t')$ *at some time* $t'\in[t,t_0]$*, has* $\mathcal{L}$*-length* $\mathcal{L}(\gamma)>Zr_0$ *(based in* t_0*),*

(ii) the ball $B(x_0,t_0,(2A+1)r_0+r)$ *does not hit the boundary* $\partial\mathcal{M}(t_0)$ *and for every* $t\in[t_0-\frac{1}{2}r_0^2,t_0]$ *the ball* $B(x_0,t,A(1-2(t_0-t)r_0^{-2})r_0+\frac{1}{10}r_0)$ *does not hit the boundary* $\partial\mathcal{M}(t)$*.*

Then $\mathcal{M}$ *is* κ*-noncollapsed on scales less than* r_0 *at all points in the ball* $B(x_0,t_0,Ar_0)$*.*

Proof. We follow the lines of [Per2, 6.3(a)].

We first consider the case in which the component of $\mathcal{M}(t)$ that contains x_0 is closed and has positive sectional curvature. Then we are done by volume comparison. So in the following, we exclude this case and hence the last option in Definition 2.14 of the canonical neighborhood assumptions will not occur.

Let $x_1 \in B(x_0, t_0, Ar_0)$ and $0 < r_1 < r_0$ such that $B(x_1, t_0, r_1)$ does not hit the boundary $\partial\mathcal{M}(t_0)$, that $P(x_1, t_0, r_1, -r_1^2)$ is non-singular and $|\mathrm{Rm}| < r_1^{-2}$ on $P(x_1, t_0, r_1, -r_1^2)$.

Claim 1. *There is a universal constant $\delta_0 > 0$ such that if $\delta < \delta_0$, then we can restrict ourselves to the case $r_1 > \frac{1}{2}r$. By this we mean that if the Lemma holds under the additional restriction that $r_1 > \frac{1}{2}r$ for some $\kappa' = \kappa'(w, A, \eta) > 0$, then it also holds whenever $r_1 \leq \frac{1}{2}r$ for some $\kappa = \kappa(w, A, \eta) > 0$.*

Proof. Let $s > 0$ be the supremum over all r_1 that satisfy the properties above. If $s \leq \frac{1}{2}r$, then there are several cases:

(1) The closure of $B(x_1, t_0, s)$ hits the boundary $\partial\mathcal{M}(t_0)$. This case is excluded by condition (ii).

(2) The closure of $P(x_1, t_0, s, -s^2)$ hits a singular point (x', t'). By Definition 2.11(3), there is a neighborhood $U \subset \mathcal{M}(t')$ of (x', t') whose geometry is modeled on a standard solution on a scale of at least $c_1 s$ for some universal $c_1 > 0$. So for sufficiently small δ, we can find a point $(x'', t') \in P(x_1, t_0, s, -s^2) \cap U$ such that $B(x'', t', c_2 s) \subset P(x_1, t_0, s, -s^2) \cap U$ for some universal $c_2 > 0$. Since the standard solution is uniformly noncollapsed, we have $\mathrm{vol}_{t'} B(x'', t', c_2 s) > \kappa' s^3$ for some universal $\kappa' > 0$. So by volume distortion $\mathrm{vol}_{t_0} B(x_1, t_0, s) > \kappa'' s^3$ for some universal $\kappa'' > 0$. By volume comparison, this implies $\mathrm{vol}_{t_0} B(x_1, t_0, r_1) > \kappa r_1^3$ for some universal $\kappa > 0$.

(3) There is a point (x', t') in the closure of $P(x_1, t_0, s, -s^2)$ with $|\mathrm{Rm}|(x', t') = s^{-2}$. Then by Lemma 3.5 and the canonical neighborhood assumptions, we can find a point $(x'', t') \in P(x_1, t_0, s, -s^2) \cap \mathcal{M}(t')$ such that $|\mathrm{Rm}|(x'', t') > \frac{1}{2}s^{-2} > r^{-2}$ and $B(x'', t', c_2 s) \subset P(x_1, t_0, s, -s^2)$ for some universal $c_2 > 0$. By the canonical neighborhood assumptions, we have $\mathrm{vol}_{t'} B(x'', t', c_2 s) > \eta c_2^3 s^3$ and as in case (2) we can conclude that $\mathrm{vol}_{t_0} B(x_1, t_0, r_1) > \kappa r_1^3$ for some universal $\kappa = \kappa(\eta) > 0$.

(4) We have $s = r_0$. So $r_0 \leq \frac{1}{2}r$. In this case choose $0 < d \leq (A+1)r_0$ maximal with the property that $|\mathrm{Rm}| < r_0^{-2} = s^{-2}$ on $B(x_1, t_0, d)$. So $d \geq r_0$. If $d = (A+1)r_0$, then

$$\mathrm{vol}_{t_0} B(x_1, t_0, d) \geq \mathrm{vol}_{t_0} B(x_0, t_0, r_0) \geq w r_0^3 = \frac{w}{(A+1)^3} d^3.$$

So by volume comparison and assumption (ii) we obtain a lower volume bound on the normalized volume of $B(x_1, t_0, r_1)$ since $r_1 < r_0 < d$. Assume now that $d < (A+1)r_0$. Then $|\mathrm{Rm}|(x', t_0) = r_0^{-2} \geq 4r^{-2}$ for some (x', t_0) in the closure of $B(x_1, t_0, d)$. As in case (3), we can find a point $(x'', t_0) \in B(x_1, t_0, d - c_1 r_0)$ with $|\mathrm{Rm}|(x'', t_0) > \frac{1}{2}r_0^{-2} > r^{-2}$. By the canonical neighborhood assumptions, we have $\mathrm{vol}_{t_0} B(x_1, t_0, d) \geq$

$\mathrm{vol}_{t_0} B(x'', t_0, c_1 r_0) > \eta c_1^3 r_0^3$. So again by volume comparison, we find that $\mathrm{vol}_{t_0} B(x_1, t_0, r_1) > \kappa r_1^3$ for some $\kappa = \kappa(\eta, A) > 0$.

Lastly, if $s > \frac{1}{2}r$, then the conditions hold for some $r_1' > \frac{1}{2}r$. If the assertion of the Lemma holds for r_1' and some $\kappa' = \kappa'(w, A, \eta) > 0$, then by volume comparison, it also holds for any $r_1 \leq r_1'$ and some $\kappa = \kappa(w, A, \eta) > 0$. □

So assume in the following that $r_1 > \frac{1}{2}r$. We will now set up an $\mathcal{L}$-geometry argument. Define for any $t \in [t_0 - r_0^2, t_0]$ and $y \in \mathcal{M}(t)$

$$L(y,t) = \inf\Big\{\mathcal{L}(\gamma) \quad : \quad \gamma : [t, t_0] \to \mathcal{M} \text{ smooth, } \gamma(t) = y, \ \gamma(t_0) = x_1\Big\}.$$

Moreover, set

$$\overline{L}(y,t) = 2\sqrt{t_0 - t} L(y,t) \qquad \text{and} \qquad \ell(y,t) = \frac{1}{2\sqrt{t_0 - t}} L(y,t).$$

Let

$$D_t = \big\{y \in \mathcal{M}(t) \quad : \quad \text{there is a minimizing } \mathcal{L}\text{-geodesic } \gamma : [t, t_0] \to \mathcal{M} \setminus \partial\mathcal{M} \\ \text{with } \gamma(t) = y \text{ and } \gamma(t_0) = x_1 \text{ that does not hit any surgery points}\big\}.$$

We can then define the reduced volume

$$\widetilde{V}(t) = (t_0 - t)^{-n/2} \int_{D_t} e^{-\ell(\cdot,t)} d\mathrm{vol}_t.$$

It is shown in [Per1, 7.1] that $\widetilde{V}(t)$ is non-decreasing in t.

We will now prove that the quantity $\ell(\cdot, t_0 - r_0^2)$ is uniformly bounded from above on $B(x_0, t_0, r_0)$ by a constant that only depends on A if δ is chosen small enough depending on A, r and η. To do this we will use a maximum principle argument on D_t. The following claim will ensure hereby that extremal points of L lie inside D_t.

Claim 2. *For any $\Lambda < \infty$ there is a constant $\delta^* = \delta^*(\Lambda, r, \eta) > 0$ such that whenever $\delta \leq \delta^*$ and $Z \geq \Lambda$, then the following holds: Assume that $r_1 > \frac{1}{2}r$. If $t \in [t_0 - r_0^2, t_0]$, $y \in \mathcal{M}(t)$ and $L(y,t) \leq \Lambda r_0$, then $y \in D_t$ and (y,t) is not a surgery point.*

Proof. Assume that $y \in \mathcal{M}(t) \setminus D_t$. Then there is a space-time curve $\gamma : [t, t_0] \to \mathcal{M}$ with $\mathcal{L}(\gamma) \leq \Lambda r_0$ that either touches $\partial\mathcal{M}$ or a surgery point. The first case is excluded by assumption (i), so γ touches a surgery point. Now the claim follows from [Per2, 5.3], [KL1, Lemma 79.3] or [Bam1, p 92]. Note that this Lemma is still true in the boundary case since by Definition 2.11(3) for every surgery point $(y', t') \in \mathcal{M}$, we have $\mathrm{dist}_{t'}(y', \partial\mathcal{M}(t')) > c\delta^{-1}$ for some universal constant $c > 0$. □

Observe that for all $t \in [t_0 - r_0^2, t_0]$, we have

$$\mathrm{scal}(\cdot, t) \geq -\frac{3}{2t} \geq -3r_0^{-2}.$$

So

$$\overline{L}(\cdot,t) \geq -6\sqrt{t_0-t}\int_{t_0-t}^{t_0} r_0^{-2}\sqrt{t_0-t'}dt' = -4r_0^{-2}(t_0-t)^2.$$

Hence, for $t \in [t_0 - \frac{1}{2}r_0^2, t_0]$ we have

$$\widehat{L}(\cdot,t) = \overline{L}(\cdot,t) + 2r_0\sqrt{t_0-t} > 0.$$

Let ϕ be a cutoff function that is equal to 1 on $(-\infty, \frac{1}{20}]$ and ∞ on $[\frac{1}{10}, \infty)$ and satisfies

$$2\frac{(\phi')^2}{\phi} - \phi'' \geq (2A+300)\phi' - C(A)\phi.$$

Here $C(A) < \infty$ is a positive constant which that only depends on A. For more details see [KL1, sec 28]. Then set for all $t \in [t_0 - \frac{1}{2}r_0^2, t_0]$ and $y \in \mathcal{M}(t)$

$$h(y,t) = \phi\big(r_0^{-1}\operatorname{dist}_t(x_0,y) - A(1-2r_0^{-2}(t_0-t))\big)\widehat{L}(y,t).$$

So $h(\cdot,t)$ is infinite outside $B(x_0,t,A(1-2(t_0-t)r_0^{-2})r_0 + \frac{1}{10}r_0) \subset \mathcal{M}(t)\setminus\partial\mathcal{M}(t)$ (compare with assumption (ii)) and hence it attains a minimum $h_0(t)$ at some interior point $y \in \mathcal{M}(t)$.

Assume first that $h(y,t) \leq 2r_0\sqrt{t_0-t}\exp(C(A)+100)$. So $L(y,t) \leq r_0\exp(C(A)+100)$. Then by Claim 2, assuming $\delta < \delta^*(\exp(C(A)+100), r, \eta)$, and $Z > \exp(C(A)+100)$ we have $y \in D_t$ and we can compute (cf [Per2, 6.3], [KL1, sec 85]) that in the barrier sense

$$r_0^2\Big(\frac{\partial}{\partial t^-} - \triangle\Big)h(y,t) \geq -C(A)h(y,t) - \Big(6 + \frac{r_0}{\sqrt{t_0-t}}\Big)\phi r_0^2.$$

So we have in the barrier sense

$$r_0^2\frac{d}{dt^-}\Big(\log\frac{h_0(t)}{\sqrt{t_0-t}}\Big) \geq -C(A) - \frac{50r_0}{\sqrt{t_0-t}}$$

if $h_0(t) \leq 2r_0\sqrt{t_0-t}\exp(C(A)+100)$.

Since $\frac{h_0(t)}{r_0\sqrt{t_0-t}} \to 2$ for $t \to t_0$, we find that if $h_0(t') \leq 2r_0\sqrt{t_0-t'}\exp(C(A)+100)$ for all $t' \in [t,t_0]$, then

$$h_0(t) \leq 2r_0\sqrt{t_0-t}\exp\big(C(A)r_0^{-2}(t_0-t) + 100r_0^{-1}\sqrt{t_0-t}\big) < 2r_0\sqrt{t_0-t}\exp(C(A)+100).$$

This implies that the assumption $h_0(t) \leq 2r_0\sqrt{t_0-t}\exp(C(A)+100)$ is actually satisfied for all $t \in [t_0 - \frac{1}{2}r_0^2, t_0]$. So we can find a $y \in B(x_0, t_0 - \frac{1}{2}r_0^2, \frac{1}{10}r_0)$ such that $L(y, t_0 - \frac{1}{2}r_0^2) \leq r_0\exp(C(A)+100) = C'(A)r_0$.

Since by length distortion estimates $B(x_0, t_0 - \frac{1}{2}r_0^2, \frac{1}{10}r_0) \subset B(x_0, t_0, \frac{1}{2}r_0)$, we find by joining paths that for all $x \in B(x_0,t_0,r_0)$ we have $L(x, t_0 - r_0^2) < C''(A)r_0$. So, assuming $\delta < \delta^*(C''(A), r, \eta)$ and $Z > C''(A)$, we can use Claim 2 to conclude that $P(x_0,t_0,r_0,-r_0^2) \cap \mathcal{M}(t_0-r_0^2) \subset D_{t_0-r_0^2}$ and we have

$$\widetilde{V}(t_0 - r_0^2) > v(w,A)$$

for some constant $v(w, A) > 0$ which only depends on A and w. This implies a uniform lower bound on $r_1^{-3} \operatorname{vol}_{t_0} B(x_1, t_0, r_1)$ (cf [Per1, 7.3], [KL1, Theorem 26.2], [Bam1, Lemma 4.2.3]). □

The noncollapsing result from Lemma 3.6 will be applied in Lemma 3.10 below. Before we continue, we introduce the concept of κ-solutions, which will be used as models for singularities and for regions of high curvature. The definition makes sense in all dimensions.

Definition 3.7 (κ-solution)**.** *Let $\kappa > 0$. An ancient Ricci flow $(M, (g_t)_{t\in(-\infty,0]})$ is called a* κ-solution *if*

(1) The curvature is uniformly bounded on $M \times (-\infty, 0]$.
(2) The metric on every time-slice is complete and has non-negative curvature operator (i.e. it has non-negative sectional curvature in dimension 3).
(3) The scalar curvature at time 0 is positive.
(4) At every point the scalar curvature is non-decreasing in time.
(5) The solution is κ-noncollapsed on all scales at all points.

We mention that there is a universal $\kappa_0 > 0$ such that every 3 dimensional κ-solution that is not round, is in fact a κ_0-solution (cf [Per1, 11.9], [KL1, Proposition 50.1]). κ-solutions can be used to detect strong ε-necks or (ε, E)-caps or, more generally, to verify the canonical neighborhood assumptions, as explained in the next Lemma.

Lemma 3.8. *There is an $\eta > 0$ and for any $\varepsilon > 0$ there is an $E = E(\varepsilon) < \infty$ such that for every orientable 3 dimensional κ-solution $(M, (g_t)_{t\in(-\infty,0]})$ the following holds: For all $r > 0$, the canonical neighborhood assumptions $CNA(r, \varepsilon, E, \eta)$ hold everywhere on $M \times (-\infty, 0]$. More precisely, either M is diffeomorphic to a spherical space form or for any $(x, t) \in M \times (-\infty, 0]$ we have:*

(a) (x, t) is a center of a strong ε-neck or an (ε, E)-cap $U \subset M$.
If $U \subset \mathbb{R}P^3 \setminus \overline{B}^3$, then there is a double cover of M such that any lift of (x, t) is the center of a strong ε-neck.
(b) $|\nabla |\mathrm{Rm}|^{-1/2}|(x, t) < \eta^{-1}$ and $|\partial_t |\mathrm{Rm}|^{-1}|(x, t) < \eta^{-1}$.
(c) $\operatorname{vol}_t B(x, t, r') > \eta r'^3$ for all $0 < r' < |\mathrm{Rm}|^{-1/2}(x, t)$.

Proof. See [Per1, 11.8], [KL1, Corollary 48.1] or [Bam1, Theorem 5.4.11]. □

The following Lemma will enable us to identify κ-solutions as limits of Ricci flows with surgeries under very weak curvature bounds.

Lemma 3.9. *There is an $\varepsilon_0 > 0$ such that: Let $\mathcal{M}^\alpha$ be a sequence of (3 dimensional) Ricci flows with surgery on the time-intervals $[-\tau_0^\alpha, 0]$, $\tau^\alpha \le \tau_0^\alpha$, $x_0^\alpha \in \mathcal{M}(0)$ a sequence of basepoints that survive until time $-\tau^\alpha$, and $a^\alpha \to \infty$ a sequence of positive numbers such that for $P^\alpha = \{(x, t) \in \mathcal{M}^\alpha \ : \ t \in [-\tau^\alpha, 0], \operatorname{dist}_t(x_0^\alpha, x) < a^\alpha\}$ the following conditions hold:*

(i) the ball $B(x_0^\alpha, t, a^\alpha)$ is relatively compact in $\mathcal{M}^\alpha(t)$ and does not hit the boundary $\partial\mathcal{M}^\alpha(t)$ for all $t \in [-\tau^\alpha, 0]$,
(ii) $|\mathrm{Rm}|(x^\alpha, 0) \le 1$,

(iii) *the curvature on P^α is φ^α-positive for some $\varphi^\alpha \to 0$,*
(iv) *all points of P^α are κ-noncollapsed on scales $< a^\alpha$ for some uniform $\kappa > 0$,*
(v) *all points on P^α satisfy the canonical neighborhood assumptions $CNA(\frac{1}{2}, \varepsilon_0, E, \eta)$ for some uniform $E, \eta > 0$,*
(vi) *there is a sequence $K^\alpha \to \infty$ such that for every surgery point $(x', t') \in P^\alpha$ we have $R(x', t') > K^\alpha$.*

Then whenever $\tau^\infty = \limsup_{\alpha\to\infty} \tau^\alpha > 0$, the pointed Ricci flows with surgery $(\mathcal{M}^\alpha, (x_0^\alpha, 0))$ subconverge to some non-singular Ricci flow $(M^\infty, (g_t^\infty)_{t\in(-\tau^\infty,0]}, (x_0^\infty, 0))$ on a manifold M^∞ without boundary. Moreover, this limiting Ricci flow has complete time-slices and bounded, non-negative sectional curvature. If $\tau^\infty = \infty$ and $|\mathrm{Rm}^\infty|(x^\infty, 0) > 0$, then $(M^\infty, (g_t^\infty)_{t\in(-\infty,0]})$ is a κ-solution.

Proof. See [Bam1, Proposition 6.3.1], [Per2, 4.2] or the proofs of [Per1, 12.1] or [KL1, Theorem 52.7]. □

We now state the second main Lemma.

Lemma 3.10 (cf [Per2, 6.3(b)+(c)])**.** *There are constants $\eta_0, \varepsilon_0 > 0$ and for every $\varepsilon \in (0, \varepsilon_0]$ there is a constant $E_0 = E_0(\varepsilon) < \infty$ such that:*
For any $1 \le A < \infty$, $w, r > 0$, $\eta \in (0, \eta_0]$ and $E \ge E_0$ there are constants $K = K(w, A, E, \eta), Z = Z(A) < \infty$ and $\widetilde{\rho} = \widetilde{\rho}(w, A, \varepsilon, E, \eta), \overline{r} = \overline{r}(A, w, E, \eta), \delta = \delta(w, A, r, \varepsilon, E, \eta) > 0$ such that:
Let $r_0^2 < t_0/2$ and let $\mathcal{M}$ be a Ricci flow with surgery (whose time-slices are allowed to have boundary) on the time-interval $[t_0 - r_0^2, t_0]$ that is performed by δ-precise cutoff and consider a point $x_0 \in \mathcal{M}(t_0)$. Assume that the canonical neighborhood assumptions $CNA(r, \varepsilon, E, \eta)$ hold on $\mathcal{M}$. We also assume that the curvature on $\mathcal{M}$ is uniformly bounded on compact time-intervals that don't contain surgery times and that all time-slices of $\mathcal{M}$ are complete.

Assume that the parabolic neighborhood $P(x_0, t_0, r_0, -r_0^2)$ is non-singular, that $|\mathrm{Rm}| \le r_0^{-2}$ on $P(x_0, t_0, r_0, -r_0^2)$ and $\mathrm{vol}_{t_0} B(x_0, t_0, r_0) \ge w r_0^3$.

In the case in which some time-slices of $\mathcal{M}$ have non-empty boundary, we assume that

(i) *every space-time curve $\gamma : [t_1, t_2] \to \mathcal{M}$ with $t_2 \in [t_0 - \frac{1}{10} r_0^2, t_0]$ and $\gamma(t_2) \in B(x_0, t_2, (A+1)r_0)$ that meets the boundary $\partial\mathcal{M}$ somewhere, has $\mathcal{L}(\gamma) > Z r_0$ (based in t_2),*
(ii) *for all $t \in [t_0 - \frac{1}{5} r_0^2, t_0]$, the ball $B(x_0, t, 2(A+3)r_0 + r)$ does not meet the boundary $\partial\mathcal{M}(t)$.*

Then

(a) *Every point $x \in B(x_0, t_0, A r_0)$ satisfies the canonical neighborhood assumptions $CNA(\widetilde{\rho} r_0, \varepsilon, E, \eta)$.*
(b) *If $r_0 \le \overline{r}\sqrt{t_0}$, then $|\mathrm{Rm}| \le K r_0^{-2}$ on $B(x_0, t_0, A r_0)$.*

Proof. The proof follows the lines of [Per2, 6.3(b), (c)].

By choosing $\widetilde{\rho}$ small and K large enough we can again exclude the case in which the component of $\mathcal{M}(t)$ that contains x_0 has positive, E-pinched sectional curvature for some time $t \le t_0$.

We first establish part (a). Choose η_0 and $E_0 = E_0(\varepsilon)$ to be strictly less/larger than the constants η, $E(\varepsilon)$ in Lemma 3.8. Assume now that given some small $\widetilde{\rho}$, there is a point $x \in B(x_0, t_0, Ar_0)$ such that (x, t_0) does not satisfy the canonical neighborhood assumptions $CNA(\widetilde{\rho} r_0, \varepsilon, E, \eta)$, i.e. we have $|\mathrm{Rm}|(x, t_0) \geq \widetilde{\rho}^{-2} r_0^{-2}$ and (x, t_0) does not satisfy the assumptions (1)–(3) in Definition 2.14. Set for $\overline{t} \in [t_0 - r_0^2, t_0]$, $\overline{x} \in \mathcal{M}(\overline{t})$

$$P_{\overline{x},\overline{t}} = \big\{(y,t) \in \mathcal{M} \ : \ t \in [\overline{t} - \tfrac{1}{20}\widetilde{\rho}^{-2}|\mathrm{Rm}|^{-1}(\overline{x},\overline{t}), \overline{t}], \ \ y \in \mathcal{M}(t), \\ \mathrm{dist}_t(x_0, y) \leq \mathrm{dist}_{\overline{t}}(x_0, \overline{x}) + \tfrac{1}{4}\widetilde{\rho}^{-1}|\mathrm{Rm}|^{-1/2}(\overline{x},\overline{t})\big\}.$$

We will now find a particular $(\overline{x}, \overline{t}) \in \mathcal{M}$ with $\overline{t} \in [t_0 - \frac{1}{10} r_0^2, t_0]$ and $\overline{x} \in B(x_0, \overline{t}, (A + \frac{1}{2}) r_0)$ by a point-picking process: Set first $(\overline{x}, \overline{t}) = (x, t_0)$. Let $\overline{q} = |\mathrm{Rm}|^{-1/2}(\overline{x}, \overline{t}) \leq \widetilde{\rho} r_0$. If every $(x', t') \in P_{\overline{x},\overline{t}}$ satisfies the canonical neighborhood assumptions $CNA(\frac{1}{2}\overline{q}, \varepsilon, E, \eta)$, then we stop. If not, we replace $(\overline{x}, \overline{t})$ by such a counterexample an start over. In every step of this algorithm, $\overline{q}$ decreases by at least a factor of $\frac{1}{2}$, which implies that the algorithm has to terminate after a finite number of steps since after a finite number of steps we have $\overline{q} < r$ and we can make use of the canonical neighborhood assumptions $CNA(r, \varepsilon, E, \eta)$ from the assumptions of the Lemma. So the algorithm yields an $(\overline{x}, \overline{t}) \in \mathcal{M}$ and a $\overline{q} = |\mathrm{Rm}|^{-1/2}(\overline{x}, \overline{t}) \leq \widetilde{\rho} r_0$ such that $(\overline{x}, \overline{t})$ does not satisfy the canonical neighborhood assumptions $CNA(\overline{q}, \varepsilon, E, \eta)$, but all points in $P_{\overline{x},\overline{t}}$ satisfy the canonical neighborhood assumptions $CNA(\frac{1}{2}\overline{q}, \varepsilon, E, \eta)$. By convergence of the geometric series, we conclude $\overline{t} - \frac{1}{20}\widetilde{\rho}^{-2}\overline{q}^2 \in [t_0 - \frac{1}{10} r_0^2, t_0]$ and $\mathrm{dist}_{\overline{t}}(x_0, \overline{x}) < (A + \frac{1}{2}) r_0$. Moreover, for all $(x', t') \in P_{\overline{x},\overline{t}}$ we have $\mathrm{dist}_{t'}(x_0, x') < (A + 1) r_0$.

Now assume that for fixed parameters $w, A, \varepsilon, E, \eta$ there is no $\widetilde{\rho}$ such that assertion (a) holds for a constant Z and a constant δ, which can also depend on r. Then we can find a sequence $\widetilde{\rho}^\alpha \to 0$ and a sequence of counterexamples $\mathcal{M}^\alpha$, t_0^α, r_0^α, x_0^α together with parameters r^α that satisfy the assumptions of the Lemma, but there are points $x^\alpha \in B(x_0^\alpha, t_0^\alpha, A r_0^\alpha)$ such that (x^α, t_0^α) don't satisfy the canonical neighborhood assumptions $CNA(\widetilde{\rho}^\alpha r_0, \varepsilon, E^\alpha, \eta)$. The choice of the constant δ^α will be explicit and arise from Lemma 3.6. We will also assume that $\delta^\alpha / r^\alpha \to 0$ for $\alpha \to \infty$.

First, let $(\overline{x}^\alpha, \overline{t}^\alpha)$ and $\overline{q}^\alpha$ be the points and the constant obtained by the algorithm from the last paragraph. We now apply Lemma 3.6 with

$$r_0 \leftarrow \tfrac{1}{10} r_0^\alpha, \ x_0 \leftarrow x_0^\alpha, \ t_0 \leftarrow t \in [\overline{t}^\alpha - \tfrac{1}{20}(\widetilde{\rho}^\alpha)^{-2}(\overline{q}^\alpha)^2, \overline{t}^\alpha], \\ w \leftarrow cw, \ A \leftarrow 10(A+1), \ r \leftarrow r^\alpha, \ E \leftarrow E^\alpha$$

to conclude that for sufficiently large Z and small δ^α (depending on w, A, r^α, η) any $(x', t') \in \mathcal{M}^\alpha$ with $t' \in [\overline{t}^\alpha - \frac{1}{20}(\widetilde{\rho}^\alpha)^{-2}(\overline{q}^\alpha)^2, \overline{t}^\alpha]$ and $x' \in B(x_0^\alpha, t', (A+1) r_0^\alpha)$ is κ-noncollapsed for some uniform $\kappa > 0$ on scales less than $\frac{1}{10} r_0^\alpha$. This implies that the points on $P_{\overline{x}^\alpha, \overline{t}^\alpha}$ are κ-noncollapsed on scales less than $\frac{1}{10} r_0^\alpha$.

Observe that the assumption on δ^α and Definition 2.11(3) imply that there is a universal constant $c' > 0$ such that for every surgery point $(x', t') \in \mathcal{M}^\alpha$ we have

$$|\mathrm{Rm}|(x', t') > c'(\delta^\alpha)^{-2} > c'\Big(\frac{\delta^\alpha}{r^\alpha}\Big)^{-2}(r^\alpha)^{-2} > c'\Big(\frac{\delta^\alpha}{r^\alpha}\Big)^{-2}(\overline{q}^\alpha)^{-2}. \tag{3.2}$$

Here we have made use of the inequality $r^\alpha < \overline{q}^\alpha$, which follows from the fact that the point $(\overline{x}^\alpha, \overline{t}^\alpha)$ satisfies the canonical neighborhood assumptions $CNA(r^\alpha, \varepsilon, E, \eta)$, but not $CNA(\overline{q}^\alpha, \varepsilon, E, \eta)$.

So for large α the point $(\overline{x}^\alpha, \overline{t}^\alpha)$ is not a surgery point. Pick $0 < \tau_0^\alpha \le \frac{1}{20}(\widetilde{\rho}^\alpha)^{-2}$ maximal such that the point $\overline{x}^\alpha$ survives until time $\overline{t}^\alpha - \tau^\alpha(\overline{q}^\alpha)^2$ and such that

$$\mathrm{dist}_t(x_0^\alpha, \overline{x}^\alpha) < \tfrac{1}{8}(\widetilde{\rho}^\alpha)^{-1}\overline{q}^\alpha \qquad \text{for all} \qquad t \in \big(\overline{t}^\alpha - \tau^\alpha(\overline{q}^\alpha)^2, \overline{t}^\alpha\big].$$

This implies

$$B(\overline{x}^\alpha, t, \tfrac{1}{8}(\widetilde{\rho}^\alpha)^{-1}\overline{q}^\alpha) \subset P_{\overline{x}^\alpha, \overline{t}^\alpha} \qquad \text{for all} \qquad t \in \big[\overline{t}^\alpha - \tau^\alpha(\overline{q}^\alpha)^2, \overline{t}^\alpha\big]. \tag{3.3}$$

So after rescaling by $(\overline{q}^\alpha)^{-1}$, the Ricci flows surgery $\mathcal{M}^\alpha$ restricted to the time-interval $[\overline{t}^\alpha - \tau^\alpha(\overline{q}^\alpha)^2, \overline{t}^\alpha]$ and based at $\overline{x}^\alpha$ satisfy the assumptions of Lemma 3.9 for some sequence $a^\alpha \to \infty$ (we also need to make use of assumption (ii) here). Hence for every subsequence of these flows with $\tau_\infty = \lim_{\alpha\to\infty}\tau^\alpha > 0$ we have subconvergence to some non-singular Ricci flow on $M_\infty \times (-\tau_\infty, 0]$ of bounded curvature.

The previous conclusion has the following implication: For every subsequence of the Ricci flows with surgery $\mathcal{M}^\alpha$ for which $\tau_\infty = \lim_{\alpha\to\infty}\tau^\alpha \le \infty$ exists there is a constant $4 \le D < \infty$ (which may depend on this subsequence) such that for every $\tau' < \tau_\infty$ we have

$$|\mathrm{Rm}|(\overline{x}^\alpha, t) < D(\overline{q}^\alpha)^{-2} \qquad \text{for all} \qquad t \in \big[\overline{t}^\alpha - \tau'(\overline{q}^\alpha)^2, \overline{t}^\alpha\big] \tag{3.4}$$

for infinitely many α (in the case $\lim_{\alpha\to\infty}\tau^\alpha = 0$ the statement holds for $D = 4$).

Fix for the moment such a subsequence for which $\tau_\infty = \lim_{\alpha\to\infty}\tau^\alpha$ exists and assume $\tau_\infty < \infty$. Observe that by (3.3) the point $(\overline{x}^\alpha, t)$ satisfies the canonical neighborhood assumptions $CNA(\frac{1}{2}\overline{q}^\alpha, \varepsilon, E, \eta)$ for all $t \in [\overline{t}^\alpha - \tau^\alpha(\overline{q}^\alpha)^2, \overline{t}^\alpha]$. This implies that (cf Definition 2.14(2))

$$|\mathrm{Rm}|(\overline{x}^\alpha, t) < 4(\overline{q}^\alpha)^{-2} \quad \text{or} \quad |\partial_t|\mathrm{Rm}|^{-1}|(\overline{x}^\alpha, t) < \eta^{-1} \qquad \text{for all} \qquad t \in \big[\overline{t}^\alpha - \tau^\alpha(\overline{q}^\alpha)^2, \overline{t}^\alpha\big]. \tag{3.5}$$

We now use (3.4) for $\tau' = \tau_\infty - \frac{\eta}{4D}$ and integrate the derivative bound of (3.5) from $\overline{t}^\alpha - \tau'(\overline{q}^\alpha)^2 = \overline{t}^\alpha - \tau_\infty(\overline{q}^\alpha)^2 + \frac{\eta}{4D}(\overline{q}^\alpha)^2$ backwards in time to any $t \ge \max\{\overline{t}^\alpha - \tau_\infty(\overline{q}^\alpha)^2 - \frac{\eta}{4D}(\overline{q}^\alpha)^2, \overline{t}^\alpha - \tau^\alpha(\overline{q}^\alpha)^2\}$. Note that $\overline{t}^\alpha - \tau^\alpha(\overline{q}^\alpha)^2 > \overline{t}^\alpha - \tau_\infty(\overline{q}^\alpha)^2 - \frac{\eta}{4D}(\overline{q}^\alpha)^2$ for sufficiently large α. So we obtain that for infinitely many α we have

$$|\mathrm{Rm}|(\overline{x}^\alpha, t) < 2D(\overline{q}^\alpha)^{-2} \qquad \text{for all} \qquad t \in \big[\overline{t}^\alpha - \tau^\alpha(\overline{q}^\alpha)^2, \overline{t}^\alpha\big].$$

In particular, it follows from (3.2) that for large α none of the points $(\overline{x}^\alpha, t)$ for $t \in [\overline{t}^\alpha - \tau^\alpha(\overline{q}^\alpha)^2, \overline{t}^\alpha]$ is a surgery point.

Next, we use the following consequence of the canonical neighborhood assumptions.

$$|\mathrm{Rm}|(x,t) < 4(\overline{q}^\alpha)^{-2} \quad \text{or} \quad |\nabla|\mathrm{Rm}|^{-1/2}|(x,t) < \eta^{-1}$$
$$\text{for all} \qquad t \in \left[\overline{t}^\alpha - \tau^\alpha(\overline{q}^\alpha)^2, \overline{t}^\alpha\right]$$
$$\text{and} \qquad x \in B(\overline{x}^\alpha, t, \tfrac{1}{8}(\widetilde{\rho}^\alpha)^{-1}\overline{q}^\alpha).$$

Integrating these assumptions yields that for infinitely many α

$$|\mathrm{Rm}| < 16D(\overline{q}^\alpha)^{-2} \quad \text{on} \quad B(\overline{x}^\alpha, t, \tfrac{1}{4}\eta D^{-1/2}\overline{q}^\alpha) \quad \text{for all} \quad t \in \left[\overline{t}^\alpha - \tau^\alpha(\overline{q}^\alpha)^2, \overline{t}^\alpha\right].$$

Note that here we have used the fact that $\frac{1}{8}(\widetilde{\rho}^\alpha)^{-1} > \frac{1}{4}\eta D^{-1/2}$ for large α. Now by distance distortion estimates (Lemma 3.4(b)), we then obtain that for infinitely many α

$$\frac{d}{dt}\,\mathrm{dist}_t(x_0^\alpha, \overline{x}^\alpha) \geq -C\eta^{-1}\sqrt{D}(\overline{q}^\alpha)^{-1} \qquad \text{for all} \qquad t \in \left[\overline{t}^\alpha - \tau^\alpha(\overline{q}^\alpha)^2, \overline{t}^\alpha\right].$$

Integrating this estimate yields that for infinitely many α

$$\mathrm{dist}_t(x_0^\alpha, \overline{x}^\alpha) < \mathrm{dist}_{\overline{t}^\alpha}(x_0^\alpha, \overline{x}^\alpha) + C\eta^{-1}\tau^\alpha\sqrt{D}\overline{q}^\alpha \qquad \text{for all} \qquad t \in \left[\overline{t}^\alpha - \tau^\alpha(\overline{q}^\alpha)^2, \overline{t}^\alpha\right].$$

Since $C\eta^{-1}\sqrt{D} < \frac{1}{16}(\widetilde{\rho}^\alpha)^{-1}$ for large α, this implies that for infinitely many α

$$\mathrm{dist}_t(x_0^\alpha, \overline{x}^\alpha) < \mathrm{dist}_{\overline{t}^\alpha}(x_0^\alpha, \overline{x}^\alpha) + \tfrac{1}{16}(\widetilde{\rho}^\alpha)^{-1}\overline{q}^\alpha \qquad \text{for all} \qquad t \in \left[\overline{t}^\alpha - \tau^\alpha(\overline{q}^\alpha)^2, \overline{t}^\alpha\right].$$

This fact however contradicts the definition of τ^α.

So it is impossible to choose a subsequence of the given Ricci flows with surgery $\mathcal{M}^\alpha$ for which $\lim_{\alpha\to\infty}\tau^\alpha$ exists and is finite. This implies that for the original sequence $\mathcal{M}^\alpha$ we have $\lim_{\alpha\to\infty}\tau^\alpha = \infty$. Hence, after rescaling by $(\overline{q}^\alpha)^{-1}$, these Ricci flows with surgery restricted to the time-interval $[\overline{t}^\alpha - \tau^\alpha(\overline{q}^\alpha)^2.\overline{t}^\alpha]$ and based at $\overline{x}^\alpha$ subconverge to a κ-solution $M_\infty \times (-\infty, 0]$. Using Lemma 3.8, we finally obtain a contradiction to the assumption that the points $(\overline{x}^\alpha, \overline{t}^\alpha)$ do not satisfy the canonical neighborhood assumptions $CNA(\overline{q}^\alpha, \varepsilon, E, \eta)$.

Part (b) follows exactly the same way as in [Per2, 6.3]. See also [KL1, Lemma 70.2] and [Bam1, Proposition 6.2.4]. The boundary $\partial\mathcal{M}(t_0)$ does not create any issues since it is far enough away from x_0. □

We now prepare for the proof of the next main result, Lemma 3.14. We believe that we have to alter the following Lemma with respect to [Per2, 6.5] to make its proof work.

Lemma 3.11 ([Per2, 6.5])**.** *For all $w > 0$ there exists $\tau_0 = \tau_0(w) > 0$ and $K_0 = K_0(w) < \infty$, such that:*
Let $(g_t)_{t\in(-\tau,0]}$ be a smooth solution to the Ricci flow on a non-singular parabolic neighborhood $P(x_0, 0, 1, -\tau)$, $\tau \leq \tau_0$. Assume that $\mathrm{sec} \geq -1$ on $B = P(x_0, 0, 1, -\tau) \cap \bigcup_{t\in[-\tau,0]} B(x_0, t, 1)$ and $\mathrm{vol}_0 B(x_0, 0, 1) \geq w$. Then

(a) $|\mathrm{Rm}| \leq K_0\tau^{-1}$ in $P(x_0, 0, \frac{1}{4}, -\tau/2)$.
(b) $B(x_0, -\tau, \frac{1}{4})$ is relatively compact in $B(x_0, 0, 1)$ and
(c) $\mathrm{vol}_{-\tau} B(x_0, -\tau, \frac{1}{4}) > \frac{1}{2}w(\frac{1}{4})^3$.

Proof. See [KL1, Lemma 82.1] for a proof of the first part and the proof of [KL1, Corollary 45.1(b)] for the third. The second part follows from the lower bound on the sectional curvature. □

Lemma 3.12 ([Per2, 6.6])**.** *For any $w > 0$ there is a $\theta_0 = \theta_0(w) > 0$ such that: Let (M, g) be a Riemannian 3-manifold and $B(x, 1) \subset M$ a ball of volume at least w that is relatively compact and does not meet the boundary of M. Assume that $\sec \geq -1$ on $B(x, 1)$. Then there exists a ball $B(y, \theta_0) \subset B(x, 1)$, such that every subball $B(z, r) \subset B(y, \theta_0)$ of any radius r has volume at least $\frac{1}{10}r^3$.*

Proof. See [KL1, Lemma 83.1]. □

Lemma 3.13. *For any $K < \infty$ there is an $\overline{r} = \overline{r}(K) < \infty$ such that: Let $r_0 \leq \overline{r}\sqrt{t_0}$ and $\frac{1}{2}t_0 \leq t \leq t_0$. Assume that (M, g) is a Riemannian manifold of t^{-1}-positive curvature and $|\mathrm{Rm}| < Kr_0^{-2}$ on M. Then the sectional curvature is bounded from below: $\sec \geq -\frac{1}{2}r_0^{-2}$.*

Proof. The claim is clear for $r_0 = 1$. The rest follows from rescaling. □

Lemma 3.14 ([Per2, 6.4])**.** *There is a constant $\varepsilon_0 > 0$ such that for all $r, \eta > 0$ and $E < \infty$ there are constants $\tau = \tau(\eta, E), \overline{r} = \overline{r}(\eta, E), \delta = \delta(r, \eta, E) > 0$ and $K = K(\eta, E), C_1 = C_1(\eta, E), Z = Z(\eta, E) < \infty$ such that:*
Let $r_0^2 < t_0/2$ and let $\mathcal{M}$ be a Ricci flow with surgery (whose time-slices are allowed to have boundary) on the time-interval $[t_0 - r_0^2, t_0]$ that is performed by δ-precise cutoff and consider a point $x_0 \in \mathcal{M}(t_0)$. Assume that the canonical neighborhood assumptions $CNA(r, \varepsilon_0, E, \eta)$ hold on $\mathcal{M}$. We also assume that the curvature on $\mathcal{M}$ is uniformly bounded on compact time-intervals that don't contain surgery times and that all time-slices of $\mathcal{M}$ are complete.

In the case in which some time-slices of $\mathcal{M}$ have non-empty boundary, we assume that

- *(i) For all $t_1 < t_2 \in [t_0 - \frac{1}{10}r_0^2, t_0]$ we have: if some $x \in B(x_0, t_0, r_0)$ survives until time t_2 and $\gamma : [t_1, t_2] \to \mathcal{M}$ is a space-time curve with endpoint $\gamma(t_2) \in B(x, t, 3r_0)$ that meets the boundary $\partial\mathcal{M}$ somewhere, then $\mathcal{L}(\gamma) > Zr_0$ (where $\mathcal{L}$ is based in t_2).*
- *(ii) For all $t \in [t_0 - \frac{1}{10}r_0, t_0]$ we have: if some $x \in B(x_0, t_0, r_0)$ survives until time t, then $B(x, t, 5r_0 + r)$ does not meet the boundary $\partial\mathcal{M}(t)$.*

Now assume that

- *(iii) $C_1\delta \leq r_0 \leq \overline{r}\sqrt{t_0}$,*
- *(iv) $\sec \geq -r_0^{-2}$ on $B(x_0, t_0, r_0)$ and*
- *(v) $\mathrm{vol}_{t_0} B(x_0, t_0, r_0) \geq \frac{1}{10}r_0^3$.*

Then the parabolic neighborhood $P(x_0, t_0, \frac{1}{4}r_0, -\tau r_0^2)$ is non-singular and we have $|\mathrm{Rm}| < Kr_0^{-2}$ on $P(x_0, t_0, \frac{1}{4}r_0, -\tau r_0^2)$.

Proof. Before we start with the main argument, we first discuss the case in which $r_0 \leq r$. We will first show that for a universal $K' = K'(E) < \infty$ and sufficiently small ε_0, we can guarantee that $|\mathrm{Rm}| < \frac{1}{2}K'r_0^{-2}$ on $B(x_0, t_0, \frac{1}{4}r_0)$. The constant K'

and the smallness of the constant ε_0 will be determined in the course of this paragraph. Assume the assumption was wrong, i.e. there is a point $x \in B(x_0, t_0, \frac{1}{4}r_0)$ such that $Q = |\mathrm{Rm}|(x, t_0) \geq \frac{1}{2}K' r_0^{-2}$. By the canonical neighborhood assumptions $CNA(r, \varepsilon_0, E, \eta)$, we know that (x, t_0) is either a center of a strong ε_0-neck or of an (ε_0, E)-cap or $\mathcal{M}(t_0)$ has positive E-pinched curvature (here we assumed that $K' > 2$). The latter case cannot occur by assumption (v) for large enough K', so assume that (x, t_0) is a center of a strong ε_0-neck or an (ε_0, E)-cap. In both other cases there is a $y \in \mathcal{M}(t_0)$ with $\mathrm{dist}_{t_0}(x, y) < EQ^{-1/2}$ such that (y, t_0) is a center of an ε_0-neck and $E^{-1}Q < |\mathrm{Rm}|(y, t_0) < EQ$. So for every $w > 0$ there is an $\varepsilon_0' = \varepsilon_0'(w) > 0$ and a $D = D(w) < \infty$ such that if $\varepsilon_0 < \varepsilon_0'$, then we can guarantee that $\mathrm{vol}_{t_0} B(y, t_0, DQ^{-1/2}) < wD^3Q^{-3/2}$. Assuming $K' > 72E^2$, we conclude that $y \in B(x_0, t_0, \frac{1}{3}r_0)$. By assumption (v) and by volume comparison, there is a universal constant $w_0 > 0$ such that $\mathrm{vol}_{t_0} B(y, t_0, d) \geq w_0 d^3$ for all $0 < d < \frac{1}{2}r_0$. Assume now that $\varepsilon_0 < \varepsilon_0'(w_0)$ and $K' > 4D^2(w_0)$. Then we obtain a contradiction for $d = D(w_0)Q^{-1/2} < \frac{1}{2}r_0$. So we indeed have $|\mathrm{Rm}| < \frac{1}{2}K' r_0^{-2}$ on $B(x_0, t_0, \frac{1}{4}r_0)$. Choose now $C_1 = K'^{1/2}$. Then by Lemma 3.5 and the fact that at every surgery point we have $|\mathrm{Rm}| > c'\delta^{-2} > C_1^2 r_0^{-2} = K' r_0^{-2}$ (compare with (3.2)), we conclude that there are $\tau' = \tau'(\eta, E), \delta' = \delta'(\eta, E) > 0$ such that if $\delta \leq \delta'$ then $P(x_0, t_0, \frac{1}{4}r_0, -\tau' r_0^2)$ is non-singular and $|\mathrm{Rm}| < K' r_0^{-2}$ on $P(x_0, t_0, \frac{1}{4}r_0, -\tau' r_0^2)$.

Now we return to the general case, allowing $r_0 \geq r$. We will first fix some constants: Consider the constants $\tau_{0,3.11}$ and $K_{0,3.11}$ from Lemma 3.11, $\theta_{0,3.12}$ from Lemma 3.12, $K_{3.10}$, $\overline{r}_{3.10}$, $Z_{3.10}$ and $\delta_{3.10}$ from Lemma 3.10 and $\overline{r}_{3.13}$ from Lemma 3.13 and set:

$$\begin{aligned}
\tau &= \min\{\tau', \tfrac{1}{2}\tau_{0,3.11}(\tfrac{1}{10}), \tfrac{1}{100}\} \\
K &= \max\{K', K_{0,3.11}(\tfrac{1}{10})\}, \\
\theta_0 &= \min\{\tfrac{1}{4}\theta_{0,3.12}(\tfrac{1}{20}), \tfrac{1}{10}\} \\
r^* &= \theta_0 \min\{\tau^{1/2}, K^{-1/2}, \tfrac{1}{10}\} \\
K^* &= (r^*)^{-2} K_{3.10}(\tfrac{1}{100}, 2(r^*)^{-1}, E, \eta) \\
Z &= Z_{3.10}(2(r^*)^{-1}) \\
\overline{r} &= \min\{\overline{r}_{3.10}(\tfrac{1}{100}, 2(r^*)^{-1}, E, \eta), \overline{r}_{3.13}(K^*)\} \\
\delta &= \min\{\delta', C_1^{-1}\theta_0 r, \delta_{3.10}(\tfrac{1}{100}, 2(r^*)^{-1}, \cdot, E, \eta), c'^{1/2}(K^*)^{-1/2}\}
\end{aligned}$$

The constants C_1 and ε_0 from the first paragraph will be kept. We will also assume that ε_0 is smaller than the constant from Lemma 3.10.

Assume that the conclusion of the Lemma is not true for some x_0, t_0 and r_0. Then $r_0 > r$. We first carry out a point-picking process. In the first step set $x_0' = x_0$, $t_0' = t_0$ and $r_0' = r_0$. If there are x_0'', t_0'' and r_0'', such that

(1) $t_0'' \in [t_0' - 2\tau(r_0')^2, t_0']$,
(2) the point x_0' survives until time t_0'' and for all $t \in (t_0'', t_0']$ there are no surgery points in $B(x_0', t, r_0')$ and $B(x_0', t, r_0') \cap \partial\mathcal{M}(t) = \emptyset$,
(3) $\mathrm{sec} \geq -(r_0')^{-2}$ on $\bigcup_{t \in [t_0'', t_0']} B(x_0', t, r_0')$,

(4) $x_0'' \in B(x_0', t_0'', r_0'/4)$,
(5) $r_0'' = \theta_0 r_0'$,
(6) $\mathrm{vol}_{t_0''} B(x_0'', t_0'', r_0'') \geq \frac{1}{10}(r_0'')^3$ and
(7) we don't have $|\mathrm{Rm}| < K(r_0'')^{-2}$ on $P(x_0'', t_0'', \frac{1}{4}r_0'', -\tau(r_0'')^2)$ or the parabolic neighborhood $P(x_0'', t_0'', \frac{1}{4}r_0'', -\tau(r_0'')^2)$ is singular,

then we replace x_0', t_0', r_0' by x_0'', t_0'', r_0'' and repeat. If not, we stop the process. Observe that here and in the rest of the proof the parabolic neighborhoods are not assumed to be non-singular unless otherwise noted (compare with Definition 2.4). Since by the choice of δ we have $C_1\delta < \theta_0 r$, we find by the discussion at the beginning of the proof and conditions (2), (3), (6), (7) that we always have $r_0' > r_0$. So the process has to terminate after a finite number of steps and yield a triple (x_0', t_0', r_0') with $r_0' > r_0$.

Observe that by the smallness of τ, θ_0, distance distortion estimates and (3), we have in every step of this process

$$P(x_0'', t_0'', r_0'', -\tfrac{1}{10}(r_0'')^2) \subset P(x_0', t_0', r_0', -\tfrac{1}{10}(r_0')^2).$$

So the parabolic neighborhoods of each step are nested have for the final triple (x_0', t_0', r_0')

$$P(x_0', t_0', r_0', -\tfrac{1}{10}(r_0')^2) \subset P(x_0, t_0, r_0, -\tfrac{1}{10}(r_0)^2).$$

So the triple (x_0', t_0', r_0') satisfies assumptions (i) and (ii) of the Lemma. By (3) and (6), also assumptions (iv) and (v) are satisfied and by the choice of δ, assumption (iii) holds. However, by (7) the assertion of the Lemma fails for the triple (x_0', t_0', r_0'). Thus, without loss of generality, we can assume that we have $x_0 = x_0'$, $t_0 = t_0'$ and $r_0 = r_0'$ and add to our assumptions that whenever we find x_0'', t_0'' and r_0'' satisfying the assumptions (1)–(6) above, the opposite of assumption (7) holds (and hence we have curvature control on $P(x_0'', t_0'', \frac{1}{4}r_0'', -\tau(r_0'')^2)$).

Now let $\overline{\tau} \leq 2\tau$ be maximal with the property that

- the point x_0 survives until time $t_0 - \overline{\tau} r_0^2$,
- for all $t \in (t_0 - \overline{\tau} r_0^2, t_0]$, there are no surgery points in $B(x_0, t, r_0)$ and $B(x_0, t, r_0) \cap \partial\mathcal{M}(t) = \emptyset$,
- $\sec \geq -r_0^{-2}$ on $\bigcup_{t \in [t_0 - \overline{\tau} r_0^2, t_0]} B(x_0, t, r_0)$.

If $\overline{\tau} = 2\tau$, then we can conclude the Lemma using Lemma 3.11.

So assume now $\overline{\tau} < 2\tau$. We will show that we then have curvature control at times $[t_0 - \overline{\tau} r_0^2, t_0]$ which implies a better lower bound on the sectional curvature and hence contradicts the maximality of $\overline{\tau}$. Fix for a moment $t \in [t_0 - \overline{\tau} r_0^2, t_0]$. By Lemma 3.11 we first conclude $\mathrm{vol}_t B(x_0, t, \frac{1}{4}r_0) > \frac{1}{20}(\frac{1}{4})^3 r_0^3$. Hence using Lemma 3.12, we can find a ball $B(y, t, \theta_0 r_0) \subset B(x_0, t, \frac{1}{4}r_0)$ such that $\mathrm{vol}_t B(y, t, \theta_0 r_0) > \frac{1}{10}\theta_0^3 r_0^3$. So the triple $(y, t, \theta_0 r_0)$ satisfies the assumptions (1)–(6) above and hence by choice of the triple (x_0, t_0, r_0), we find that the parabolic neighborhood $P(y, t, \frac{1}{4}\theta_0 r_0, -\tau\theta_0^2 r_0^2)$ is non-singular and

$$|\mathrm{Rm}| < K\theta_0^{-2} r_0^{-2} \qquad \text{on} \qquad P(y, t, \tfrac{1}{4}\theta_0 r_0, -\tau\theta_0^2 r_0^2).$$

This implies that $|\mathrm{Rm}| < (r^* r_0)^{-2}$ on $P(y, t, r^* r_0, -(r^* r_0)^2)$. Applying Lemma 3.10(b) for $x_0 \leftarrow y$, $t_0 \leftarrow t$, $r_0 \leftarrow r^* r_0$, $w \leftarrow \frac{1}{100}$, $A \leftarrow A^* = 2(r^*)^{-1}$, $E \leftarrow E$,

$\eta \leftarrow \eta$, $r \leftarrow r$ yields

$$|\mathrm{Rm}|(\cdot,t) < K^* r_0^{-2} \qquad \text{on} \qquad B(y,t,2r_0) \qquad \text{for all} \qquad t \in [t_0 - \overline{\tau} r_0^2, t_0].$$

Observe here that by the choice of Z and assumptions (i), (ii) of this Lemma, the assumptions (i), (ii) of Lemma 3.10 are satisfied. We conclude that

$$|\mathrm{Rm}|(\cdot,t) < K^* r_0^{-2} \quad \text{on} \quad B(x_0,t,r_0) \quad \text{for all} \quad t \in [t_0 - \overline{\tau} r_0^2, t_0].$$

In particular by (3.2) and the choice of δ, there are no surgery points on $B(x_0,t,r_0)$ for all $t \in [t_0 - \overline{\tau} r_0^2 - (r^* r_0)^2, t_0]$. By Lemma 3.13, this curvature bound implies $\sec \geq -\frac{1}{2} r_0^{-2}$ on $B(x_0,t,r_0)$ for all $t \in [t_0 - \overline{\tau} r_0^2, t_0]$. Also the point x_0 survives until some time which is strictly smaller than $t_0 - \overline{\tau} r_0^2$ and $B(x_0,t,r_0)$ does not contain surgery points or meet the boundary for times which are slightly smaller than $t_0 - \overline{\tau} r_0^2$. This contradicts the maximality of $\overline{\tau}$. □

Proof of Proposition 3.2. By Lemma 3.12 we can find a ball $B(y,t_0,\theta_0(w) r_0) \subset B(x_0,t_0,r_0)$ with $\mathrm{vol}_{t_0} B(y,t_0,\theta_0(w) r_0) > \frac{1}{10}(\theta_0 r_0)^3$. So we can apply Lemma 3.14 with $t_0 \leftarrow t_0$, $x_0 \leftarrow y$, $r_0 \leftarrow \theta_0 r_0$, $\varepsilon_0 \leftarrow \varepsilon_0$, $E \leftarrow E$, $\eta \leftarrow \eta$, $r \leftarrow r$ and obtain that if

$$C_{1,3.14}(\eta, E)\delta \leq \theta_0 r_0,$$

$\delta < \delta_{3.14}(r,\eta,E)$, $Z > Z_{3.14}(r,\eta,E)$ and $r_0 < \overline{r}_{3.14}(\eta,E)\sqrt{t_0}$ then the parabolic neighborhood $P(y,t_0,\frac{1}{4}\theta_0 r_0, -\tau_{3.14}(\eta,E)\theta_0^2 r_0^2)$ is non-singular and

$$|\mathrm{Rm}| < K_{3.14}(\eta,E)\theta_0^{-2} r_0^{-2} \qquad \text{on} \qquad P(y,t_0,\tfrac{1}{4}\theta_0 r_0, -\tau_{3.14}\theta_0^2 r_0^2).$$

Now choose $r^* = r^*(w,\eta,E) > 0$ so small that $P(y,t,r^* r_0, (r^* r_0)^2) \subset P(y,t_0, \frac{1}{4}\theta_0 r_0, -\tau_{3.14}\theta_0^2 r_0^2)$ for all $t \in [t_0 - (r^* r_0)^2, t_0]$ and $|\mathrm{Rm}| < (r^* r_0)^{-2}$ there. We can then invoke Lemma 3.10(b) with $t_0 \leftarrow t \in [t_0 - (r^* r_0)^2, t_0]$, $x_0 \leftarrow y$, $r_0 \leftarrow r^* r_0$, $w \leftarrow \frac{1}{100}$, $A \leftarrow (A+2)(r^*)^{-1}$, $r \leftarrow r$, $\eta \leftarrow \eta$, $E \leftarrow E$ and obtain that if $\delta < \delta_{3.10}(\frac{1}{100}, (A+2)(r^*)^{-1}, r, \cdot, E, \eta)$, $Z > Z_{3.10}((A+2)(r^*)^{-1})$ and $r_0 < \overline{r}_{3.10}((A+2)(r^*)^{-1}, \frac{1}{100}, E, \eta)\sqrt{t_0}$, then

$$|\mathrm{Rm}| < K r_0^{-2} \qquad \text{on} \qquad B(y,t,(A+2)r_0) \qquad \text{for all} \qquad t \in [t_0 - (r^* r_0)^2, t_0]$$

for $K = K_{3.10}(\frac{1}{100}, (A+2)(r^*)^{-1}, E, \eta)(r^*)^{-2} < \infty$. As in (3.2), we conclude that if $C_1' \delta \leq r_0$ for some $C_1' = C_1'(w,A,\eta,E) < \infty$, then there are no surgery points in $B(y,t,(A+2)r_0)$ for all $t \in [t_0 - (r^* r_0)^2, t_0]$ and we can find a $\tau = \tau(w,A,\eta,E) > 0$ such that $P(y,t_0,(A+1)r_0, -\tau r_0^2)$ is non-singular and $B(y,t_0,(A+1)r_0) \subset B(y,t,(A+2)r_0)$ for all $t \in [t_0 - \tau r_0^2, t_0]$. This implies that $|\mathrm{Rm}| < K r_0^{-2}$ on $P(x_0,t_0,Ar_0,-\tau r_0^2) \subset P(y,t_0(A+1)r_0,-\tau r_0^2)$ in the case in which $C_1 \delta \leq r_0$ for some $C_1 = C_1(w,A,\eta,E) < \infty$. The higher derivative estimates follow from Shi's estimates on a slightly smaller parabolic neighborhood.

It remains to consider the case $C_1 \delta > r_0$. Assuming δ to be sufficiently small depending on r, we can conclude that then $r_0 < r$. Let $Q = |\mathrm{Rm}|(x_0,t_0)$. In the next paragraph we show that $Q r_0^2$ is bounded by a constant which only depends on w, E and η.

For this paragraph, fix w, E and η and assume that $Q r_0^2 > 1$. Using the same reasoning as in the proof of Lemma 3.10(b) (compare with the "bounded curvature at bounded distance"-estimate in [Per2, Claim 2, 4.2], see also the proof

of [KL1, Lemma 89.2] or [KL1, Lemma 70.2] or [Bam1, Proposition 6.2.4]) we can conclude that $|\mathrm{Rm}| > K_1^*(Qr_0^2)r_0^{-2}$ on $B(x_0,t_0,r_0)$ if $r_0 < \overline{r}^*(Qr_0^2)\sqrt{t_0}$ for some functions $K_1^*, \overline{r}^* : [0,\infty) \to (0,\infty)$ with $K_1^*(s) \to \infty$ and $s \to \infty$ (we remark that for this argument the basepoint has to be chosen at a point $x' \in B(x_0,t_0,r_0)$ with $r_0^{-2} \leq |\mathrm{Rm}|(x',t_0) \leq K_1^*(Qr_0^2)$). So there is some $S_1 < \infty$ such that if $Qr_0^2 > S_1$ and $r_0 < \overline{r}^*(S_1)\sqrt{t_0}$, then all points on $B(x_0,t_0,r_0)$ are centers of strong ε-necks or (ε,E)-caps whose cross-sectional 2-spheres have diameter at most $C(K_1^*(Qr_0^2))^{-1/2}r_0$. These necks and caps can be glued together to give long tubes as described in [Bam1, Proposition 5.4.7] or [KL1, sec 58] and we conclude that $\mathrm{vol}_{t_0} B(x_0,t_0,r_0) < w^*(Qr_0^2)r_0^3$ for some function $w^* : [0,\infty) \to (0,\infty)$ with $w^*(s) \to 0$ as $x \to \infty$. This finally shows that there is a universal constant $S_2 < \infty$ such that $Qr_0^2 < S_2$.

Again, by the same reasoning as before (this time, we choose the basepoint to be (x_0,t_0)), we obtain the estimate $|\mathrm{Rm}| < K_2^* r_0^{-2}$ on $B(x_0,t_0,(A+1)r_0)$ for some universal constant $K_2^* = K_2^*(w,A,E,\eta) < \infty$ if $r_0 < \overline{r}^{**}(w,A,E,\eta)\sqrt{t_0}$. Let $\overline{\tau} \geq 0$ be maximal such that the parabolic neighborhood $P(x_0,t_0,(A+1)r_0,-\overline{\tau}r_0^2)$ is non-singular. By Lemma 3.5, we conclude that there is a constant $\tau_0 > 0$ such that $|\mathrm{Rm}| < 2K_2^* r_0^{-2}$ on $P(x_0,t_0,(A+1)r_0,-\min\{\overline{\tau},\tau_0\}r_0^2)$. If $\tau' \geq \tau_0$, then we can deduce curvature derivative bounds on $B(x_0,t_0,Ar_0)$ by Shi's estimates. On the other hand, if $\overline{\tau} < \tau_0$, then by assuming δ to be sufficiently small depending on m, we can use Definition 2.11(3) to conclude that $|\nabla^m \mathrm{Rm}| < C_k r_0^{-2-k}$ for all $k \leq m$ on initial time-slice of $P(x_0,t_0,(A+1)r_0,-\tau' r_0^2)$. So by a modified version of Shi's estimates (see [Cetal, sec 14.4]) we obtain a bound on $r_0^{2+k}|\nabla^k \mathrm{Rm}|$ in $B(x_0,t_0,Ar_0)$ for all $k \leq m$.

Finally, we consider the case $r_0 = \rho(x_0,t_0)$. Applying the Proposition with $A \leftarrow 1$ yields $|\mathrm{Rm}| < Kr_0^{-2}$ on $B(x_0,t_0,r_0)$ for some $K = K(w,E,\eta) < \infty$. So by Lemma 3.13, if we had $r_0 < \overline{r}_{3.13}(K)\sqrt{t_0}$, then $\sec \geq -\frac{1}{2}r_0^{-2}$ on $B(x_0,t_0,r_0)$ which would contradict the choice r_0. □

Proof of Corollary 3.3. Let ε_0 be the constant from Proposition 3.2. Observe that by Proposition 2.15 there are constants $\underline{\eta} > 0$, $\underline{E}_{\varepsilon_0} < \infty$ and decreasing, continuous, positive functions $\underline{r}_{\varepsilon_0}, \underline{\delta}_{\varepsilon_0} : [0,\infty) \to (0,\infty)$ such that if $\delta(t) \leq \underline{\delta}_{\varepsilon_0}(t)$ for all $t \in [0,\infty)$, then every point $(x,t) \in \mathcal{M}$ satisfies the canonical neighborhood assumptions $CNA(\underline{r}_{\varepsilon_0}(t),\varepsilon_0,\underline{E}_{\varepsilon_0},\underline{\eta})$. Now consider the constant $\delta_{3.2} = \delta_{3.2}(r,w,A,E,\eta,m)$ from Proposition 3.2. We can assume that it depends on its parameters r, w and A in a monotone way, i.e. $\delta_{3.2}(r',w',A',E,\eta,m') \leq \delta_{3.2}(r,w,A,E,\eta,m)$ if $r' \leq r$, $w' \leq w$, $A' \geq A$ and $m' \geq m$. Assume now that for all $t \geq 0$

$$\delta(t) < \min\big\{\delta_{3.2}(\underline{r}_{\varepsilon_0}(2t),t^{-1},t,\underline{E}_{\varepsilon_0},\underline{\eta},[t^{-1}]),\ \underline{\delta}_{\varepsilon_0}(t)\big\}.$$

Let w,A,m be given. Choose $T = T(w,A,m) < \infty$ such that $2T^{-1} < w$, $\frac{1}{2}T > A$ and $\frac{1}{2}T > m$.

Consider now the point x, the time $t > T$ and the scale r. Observe that $\mathcal{M}$ satisfies the canonical neighborhood assumptions $CNA(\underline{r}_{\varepsilon_0}(t),\varepsilon_0,\underline{E}_{\varepsilon_0},\underline{\eta})$ on $[t-r^2,t]$

and the surgeries on $[t-r^2,t]$ are performed by $\delta_{3.2}(\underline{r}_{\varepsilon_0}(t), 2t^{-1}, \frac{1}{2}t, \underline{E}_{\varepsilon_0}, \underline{\eta}, [\frac{1}{2}t^{-1}])$-precise cutoff. So we can apply Proposition 3.2 with $x_0 \leftarrow x$, $t_0 \leftarrow t$, $r_0 \leftarrow r$, $r \leftarrow \underline{r}_{\varepsilon_0}(t)$, $w \leftarrow w$, $A \leftarrow A$, $E \leftarrow \underline{E}_{\varepsilon_0}$, $\eta \leftarrow \underline{\eta}$, $m \leftarrow m$ to conclude that if $r \leq \overline{r}_{3.2}(w, A, \underline{E}_{\varepsilon_0}, \underline{\eta})\sqrt{t_0}$, then $|\nabla^m \mathrm{Rm}| < K_{m,3.2}(w, A, \underline{E}_{\varepsilon_0}, \underline{\eta}) r_0^{-2}$ on $B(x,t,Ar)$. If the surgeries on $[t-r^2,t]$ are performed by $C^{-1}_{1,3.2}(w, A, \underline{E}_{\varepsilon_0}, \underline{\eta})$-precise cutoff, then $P(x,t,Ar,-\tau_{3.2}(w, A, \underline{E}_{\varepsilon_0}, \underline{\eta}))$ is non-singular and $|\nabla^m \mathrm{Rm}| < K_{m,3.2}(w, A, \underline{E}_{\varepsilon_0}, \underline{\eta}) r_0^{-2}$ there. This establishes assertion (a)

For assertion (b) we argue as follows. If $\rho(x,t) \leq \overline{r}\sqrt{t}$, then as discussed in the last paragraph for $r = \rho(x,t)$, we obtain $r = \rho(x,t) > \widehat{r}\sqrt{t}$. So in general, we have $\rho(x,t) > \min\{\overline{r}, \widehat{r}\}\sqrt{t}$ and we can apply assertion (a) with $r = \overline{r}\sqrt{t}$. Observe that sufficiently large T, we indeed have $C_1\delta(\frac{1}{2}t) < \min\{\overline{r}, \widehat{r}\}\sqrt{t} < r$. □

3.2. **The thick-thin decomposition.** We now describe how, in the long-time picture, Ricci flows with surgery decompose the manifold into a thick and a thin part. In this process, the thick part approaches a hyperbolic metric while the thin part collapses at local scales. Compare this Proposition with [Per2, 7.3] and [KL1, Proposition 90.1].

Proposition 3.15. *There is a function $\delta : [0,\infty) \to (0,\infty)$ such that given a Ricci flow with surgery $\mathcal{M}$ with normalized initial conditions that is performed by $\delta(t)$-precise cutoff defined on the interval $[0,\infty)$, we can find a constant $T_0 < \infty$, a function $w : [T_0,\infty) \to (0,\infty)$ with $w(t) \to 0$ as $t \to \infty$ and a collection of orientable, complete, finite volume hyperbolic (i.e. of constant sectional curvature -1) manifolds $(H'_1, g_{\mathrm{hyp},1}), \dots, (H'_k, g_{\mathrm{hyp},k})$ such that:*
There are finitely many embedded 2-tori $T_{1,t}, \dots, T_{m,t} \subset \mathcal{M}(t)$ for $t \in [T_0,\infty)$ that move by isotopies and don't hit any surgery points and that separate $\mathcal{M}(t)$ into two (possibly empty) closed subsets $\mathcal{M}_{\mathrm{thick}}(t), \mathcal{M}_{\mathrm{thin}}(t) \subset \mathcal{M}(t)$ such that

- *(a) $\mathcal{M}_{\mathrm{thick}}(t)$ does not contain surgery points for any $t \in [T_0,\infty)$.*
- *(b) The $T_{i,t}$ are incompressible in $\mathcal{M}(t)$ and $t^{-1/2}\operatorname{diam}_t T_{i,t} < w(t)$.*
- *(c) The topology of $\mathcal{M}_{\mathrm{thick}}(t)$ stays constant in t and $\mathcal{M}_{\mathrm{thick}}(t)$ is a disjoint union of components $H_{1,t}, \dots, H_{k,t} \subset \mathcal{M}_{\mathrm{thick}}(t)$ such that the interior of each $H_{i,t}$ is diffeomorphic to H'_i.*
- *(d) We can find an embedded cross-sectional torus $T'_{j,t}$ inside each cusp, at distance of at least $w^{-1}(t)$ from a fixed base point, which moves by isotopy and speed at most $w(t)$ such that the following holds: Chop off the ends of the H'_i along the $T'_{j,t}$ and call the remaining open manifolds $H''_{i,t}$. Then there are smooth families of diffeomorphisms $\Psi_{i,t} : H''_{i,t} \to H_i$ which become closer and closer to being isometries, i.e.*

$$\left\| \tfrac{1}{4t}\Psi^*_{i,t} g(t) - g_{\mathrm{hyp},i} \right\|_{C^{[w^{-1}(t)]}(H''_{i,t})} < w(t)$$

and which move slower and slower in time, i.e.

$$\sup_{H''_{i,t}} t^{1/2} |\partial_t \Psi_{i,t}| < w(t)$$

for all $t \in [T_0, \infty)$ *and* $i = 1, \dots, k$. *Moreover, the sectional curvatures on a* $w^{-1}(t)\sqrt{t}$*-tubular neighborhood of* $\mathcal{M}_{\text{thick}}(t)$ *lie in the interval* $(\frac{1}{t}(-\frac{1}{4} - w(t)), \frac{1}{t}(-\frac{1}{4} + w(t)))$. *And for every 2-torus* $T_{i,t}$, $i = 1, \dots, m$, *there are neighborhoods* $P_{i,t} \subset \mathcal{M}_{\text{thin}}(t)$ *with* $T_{i,t} \subset P_{i,t}$ *that have the following properties:* $P_{i,t} \approx T^2 \times I$, *the boundary components of* $P_{i,t}$ *have distance of at least* $w^{-1}(t)\sqrt{t}$ *from one another, and* $P_{i,t}$ *carries a* T^2*-fibration over an interval whose fibers have diameter* $< w(t)\sqrt{t}$.

(e) *A large neighborhood of the part* $\mathcal{M}_{\text{thin}}(t)$ *is better and better collapsed, i.e. for every* $t \geq T_0$ *and* $x \in \mathcal{M}(t)$ *with*

$$\text{dist}_t(x, \mathcal{M}_{\text{thin}}(t)) < w^{-1}(t)\sqrt{t}$$

we have

$$\text{vol}_t B(x, t, \rho_{\sqrt{t}}(x, t)) < w(t)\rho^3_{\sqrt{t}}(x, t).$$

4. Long-time estimates under the presence of collapse

In the following we derive more specialized estimates using the methods and results presented in the previous section. Those statements will be used in [BamD].

4.1. **The goodness property.**

The following notion will become important for us.

Definition 4.1 (goodness)**.** *Let* (M, g) *be a complete Riemannian 3-manifold,* $r_0 > 0$ *and consider the function* $\rho_{r_0} : M \to (0, \infty)$ *from Definition 3.1. Let* $w > 0$ *be a constant and* $x \in M$ *be a point.*

(1) *Let* $\widetilde{x}$ *be a lift of* x *in the universal cover* $\widetilde{M}$ *of* M. *Then* $x \in M$ *is called* w-good at scale r_0 *if* $\text{vol}\, B(\widetilde{x}, \rho_{r_0}(x)) > w\rho^3_{r_0}(x)$. *Here* $B(\widetilde{x}, \rho_{r_0}(x))$ *denotes the* $\rho_{r_0}(x)$*-ball in the universal cover* $\widetilde{M}$ *of* M.

(2) *Let* $U \subset M$ *be an open subset and assume that* $x \in U$. *Assume now that* $\widetilde{x}$ *is a lift of* x *in the universal cover* $\widetilde{U}$ *of* U. *Then* x *is called* w-good at scale r_0 relatively to U *if either* $B(x, \rho_{r_0}(x)) \not\subset U$ *or* $\text{vol}\, B(\widetilde{x}, \rho_{r_0}(x)) > w\rho^3_{r_0}(x)$, *where now* $B(\widetilde{x}, \rho_{r_0}(x))$ *denotes the* $\rho_{r_0}(x)$*-ball in the universal cover* $\widetilde{U}$ *of* U.

(3) *The point* x *is called* locally w-good at scale r_0 *if it is* w*-good at scale* r_0 *relatively to* $B(x, \rho_{r_0}(x))$.

Observe that the choice of the lift $\widetilde{x}$ of x is not essential. We remark that the property "w-good" implies the properties "w-good relatively to a subset U" and "locally w-good". The opposite implication however is generally false: Consider for example a smoothly embedded solid torus $S \subset M$, $S \approx S^1 \times D^2$ and a collar neighborhood U of ∂S in S, i.e. $U \subset S$, $U \approx T^2 \times (0, 100)$ and $\partial S \subset \partial U$, such that the geometry on U is close to product geometry $T^2 \times (0, 100)$ in which the T^2-factor is very small. Then for some $w > 0$ all points of U are w-good relatively to U as well as locally w-good, but none of the points of U are w-good (see [Bam0, Figure 2] for an illustration).

We remark that by volume comparison there is a $\widetilde{c} > 0$ such that if $x \in M$ is w-good at scale $r_0 > 0$ for some $w > 0$, then x is also $\widetilde{c}w$-good at any scale $r_0' \leq r_0$.

4.2. **Universal covers of Ricci flows with surgery.** In the following we will need to carry out Perelman's methods in the universal covering flow $\widetilde{\mathcal{M}}$ of a given Ricci flow with surgery $\mathcal{M}$. In the case in which $\mathcal{M}$ is non-singular, $\widetilde{\mathcal{M}}$ is just the pullback of the time-dependent metric onto the universal cover of the underlying manifold. In the general case, the existence of $\widetilde{\mathcal{M}}$ is established by the following Lemma.

Lemma 4.2. *Let $\mathcal{M}$ be a Ricci flow with surgery on a time-interval $I \subset [0, \infty)$ that is performed by precise cutoff and assume that if $\mathcal{M}$ has surgeries, then there is a minimal surgery time. Then there is a Ricci flow with surgery $\widetilde{\mathcal{M}}$ (called the* universal covering flow*) that is performed by precise cutoff and a family of Riemannian coverings $\pi_t : \widetilde{\mathcal{M}}(t) \to \mathcal{M}(t)$ that are locally constant in time away from surgery points such that the components of all time-slices $\widetilde{\mathcal{M}}(t)$ are all simply connected (i.e. $\widetilde{\mathcal{M}}(t)$ is the disjoint union of components which are isometric to the universal cover of $\mathcal{M}(t)$).*

Moreover, if $\mathcal{M}$ is performed by $\delta(t)$-cutoff for some $\delta : I \to (0, \infty)$, then so is $\widetilde{\mathcal{M}}$. If all time-slices of $\mathcal{M}$ are complete, then the same is true for $\widetilde{\mathcal{M}}$. If the curvature on $\mathcal{M}$ is bounded on compact time-intervals that don't contain surgery times, then this property also holds on $\widetilde{\mathcal{M}}$.

Proof. Recall that $\mathcal{M} = ((T^i), (M^i \times I^i, g_t^i), (\Omega^i), (U_\pm^i), (\Phi^i))$ where each g_t^i is a Ricci flow on the 3-manifold M^i defined for times I^i. We can lift each of these flows to the universal cover $\widetilde{M}_0^i$ of M^i via the natural projections $\pi_0^i : \widetilde{M}_0^i \to M^i$ and obtain families of metrics $\widetilde{g}_{0,t}^i$ which still satisfy the Ricci flow equation.

We will now assemble the flows $(\widetilde{M}_0^i \times I^i, \widetilde{g}_{0,t}^i)$ to a Ricci flow with surgery $\widetilde{\mathcal{M}}$. Each time-slice $\widetilde{\mathcal{M}}(t)$ of the resulting flow will be composed of a (possibly infinite) number of copies of components of $(\widetilde{M}_0^i, \widetilde{g}_{0,t}^i)$ if $t \in I^i$. If there are no surgery times in I, i.e. $I = I^1$, then we set $\mathcal{M} = (\cdot, (\widetilde{M}_0^1, \widetilde{g}_{0,t}^1), \cdot, \cdot, \cdot)$ and we are done. Assume now that there are surgery times. For any i let $\mathcal{M}^i$ be the restriction of $\mathcal{M}$ to the time-interval $I \cap (-\infty, T^i)$ and if T^{i-1} is the last surgery time, set $\mathcal{M}^i = \mathcal{M}$. By induction, we can assume that $\widetilde{\mathcal{M}}^i$ already exists and we only need to prove that we can extend this flow to a Ricci flow with surgery $\widetilde{\mathcal{M}}^{i+1}$ that is the universal covering flow of $\mathcal{M}^{i+1}$. In order to do this, it suffices to construct the objects $(\widetilde{M}^{i+1} \times I^{i+1}, \widetilde{g}_t^{i+1})$, Ω^i, $U_\pm^i$, Φ^i and the projection $\pi^{i+1} : \widetilde{M}^{i+1} \to M^{i+1}$.

Fix i and consider $(\widetilde{M}^i \times I^i, \widetilde{g}_t^i)$ from $\widetilde{\mathcal{M}}^i$ and the projection $\pi^i : \widetilde{M}^i \to M^i$ corresponding to π_t. Denote by $\widetilde{\Omega}^i \subset \widetilde{M}^i$ the preimage of Ω^i and by $\widetilde{U}_-^i \subset \widetilde{\Omega}^i$ the preimage of U_-^i under π^i and let $\widetilde{U}_{0,+}^i \subset \widetilde{M}_0^{i+1}$ be the preimage of U_+^i under π_0^{i+1}. Observe that the subset $U_-^i \subset M^i$ is bounded by pairwise disjoint, embedded 2-spheres. So for every point $p \in U_-^i$, the natural map $\pi_1(U_-^i, p) \to \pi_1(M^i, p)$

is an injection. Consider now the set $\widetilde{U}^i_{0,+} \subset \widetilde{M}^{i+1}_0$. The complement of this subset is still a collection of pairwise disjoint, embedded 3-disks and hence each component of $\widetilde{U}^i_{0,+}$ is simply connected. Via $(\Phi^i)^{-1} : U^i_+ \to U^i_-$ we find a covering map $\widetilde{U}^i_{0,+} \to U^i_+ \to U^i_- \subset M^i$. Since every component $\mathcal{C}_+$ of $\widetilde{U}^i_{0,+}$ is simply-connected, we find a lift $\phi^i_{\mathcal{C}_+,\mathcal{C}_-} : \widetilde{U}^i_{0,+} \to \widetilde{M}^i$ for every component $\mathcal{C}_-$ of $\widetilde{U}^i_-$ with $\pi_0^{i+1}(\mathcal{C}_+) = \Phi^i(\pi^i(\mathcal{C}_-))$ such that $\phi^i(\mathcal{C}_+) = \mathcal{C}_-$. Using the fact that $U^i_- \to M^i$ is π_1-injective, we conclude that $\phi^i_{\mathcal{C}_+,\mathcal{C}_-}$ is injective.

Choose for every component $\mathcal{C}_-$ of $\widetilde{U}^i_-$ the (unique) component $\mathcal{C}_+ = \mathcal{C}_+(\mathcal{C}_-)$ of $\widetilde{U}^i_{0,+}$ such that $\pi_0^{i+1}(\mathcal{C}_+) = \Phi^i(\pi^i(\mathcal{C}_-))$. Let $\widetilde{M}^{i+1}_0(\mathcal{C}_+)$ be the component of $\widetilde{M}^{i+1}_0$ that contains $\mathcal{C}_+$. Observe that $\mathcal{C}_+$ is the only component of $\widetilde{U}^i_{0,+}$ in $\widetilde{M}^{i+1}_0(\mathcal{C}_+)$. Now let $\widetilde{M}^{i+1}$ the disjoint union of all components $\widetilde{M}^{i+1}_0(\mathcal{C}_+(\mathcal{C}_-))$ where $\mathcal{C}_-$ runs through all components of $\widetilde{U}^i_-$. The set U^i_+ is the disjoint union of all the $\mathcal{C}_+(\mathcal{C}_-)$ and the diffeomorphism Φ^i is defined to be the inverse of $\phi^i_{\mathcal{C}_+(\mathcal{C}_-),\mathcal{C}_+}$ on each $\mathcal{C}_-$. This finishes the proof. □

4.3. **Quotients of necks.** Before we discuss the main tools, we need to establish the following Lemma, which asserts that sufficiently precise ε-necks cannot have arbitrarily small quotients.

Lemma 4.3. *There are constants $\widetilde{\varepsilon}_0, \widetilde{w}_0 > 0$ such that: Let (M, g) be a Riemannian manifold, $\varepsilon \leq \widetilde{\varepsilon}_0$ and assume that $x_0 \in M$ is a center of an ε-neck and that $0 < r < |\mathrm{Rm}|^{-1/2}(x)$. Consider a local Riemannian covering $\pi : (M, g) \to (M', g')$ (i.e. $\pi^* g' = g$) such that $\pi(M) \subset M'$ is not closed and let $x'_0 = \pi(x_0) \in M'$. Then $\mathrm{vol}\, B(x'_0, r) > \widetilde{w}_0 r^3$.*

Proof. We may assume without loss of generality that the scale λ in Definition 2.6 is equal to 1 (and hence $r < 1.1$ for small ε), that M is an ε-neck and that π is surjective. So, we can identify $M = S^2 \times (-\frac{1}{\varepsilon}, \frac{1}{\varepsilon})$ and assume that $\|g - g_{S^2\times\mathbb{R}}\|_{C^{[\varepsilon^{-1}]}} < \varepsilon$. If ε is small enough, there is a smooth unit vector field X on M pointing in the direction of the eigenspace of Ric associated to the smallest eigenvalue which is unique up to sign. For any $y_1, y_2 \in M$ with $\pi(y_1) = \pi(y_2)$, we have $d\pi(X_{y_1}) = \pm d\pi(X_{y_2})$. So by possibly passing to a 2-fold cover of M', we can assume that $d\pi(X) = X'$ for some smooth vector field X' on M'. Moreover, by possibly passing to another 2-fold cover, we can assume that M' is orientable. Let $\Sigma \subset M$ be the embedded 2-sphere corresponding to $S^2 \times \{0\}$. If ε is small enough, the trajectories of X cross Σ exactly once and transversely. Finally, let $U_0 \subset M$ be the open set corresponding to $S^2 \times (-20, 20)$ and assume that $\varepsilon^{-1} > 100$.

We will first show by contradiction that π restricted to the ball $B(x_0, 1)$ is injective. So assume that there are two distinct points $y_1, y_2 \in B(x_0, 1)$ with $\pi(y_1) = \pi(y_2)$. Consider a geodesic segment γ between y_1 and x_0 and lift its projection $\pi \circ \gamma$ starting from y_2. This produces a point $x_1 \in M$ with $\pi(x_0) = \pi(x_1)$ and $\mathrm{dist}(x_0, x_1) < 2$. Moreover, we can construct an isometric local deck transformation $\varphi : U_0 \to U_1 \subset M$ with $\varphi(x_0) = x_1$. We note that φ preserves orientation and the vector field X.

Now for $x \in \Sigma$ define $\varphi'(x)$ to be the unique intersection point of the X-trajectory passing through $\varphi(x)$ with Σ. Then $\varphi' : \Sigma \to \Sigma$ is bijective continuous and orientation preserving. Hence it has a fixed point $z_0 \in \Sigma$.

Let now $z_k = \varphi^{(k)}(z_0) \in U_1$ as long as this is defined. Those points all lie on the trajectory through z_0 and have consecutive distance less than 10. Hence, there is a point $z_{k_0} \in U_1$ of distance more than 10 to z_0. This implies that $\Sigma' = \varphi^{(k_0)}(\Sigma)$ is disjoint from Σ. But then the part of M that is enclosed between Σ and Σ', maps to a closed manifold contradicting the assumptions.

So for all $r \leq 1$ we have $\operatorname{vol} B(x_0', r) = \operatorname{vol} B(x_0, r) > cr^3$ for some universal $c > 0$. This finishes the proof. □

4.4. **Bounded curvature around good points.** We start out by presenting a simple generalization of Corollary 3.3 and consequence of Proposition 3.2, which exhibits the flavor of the subsequent results. We point out that the following Proposition is also a consequence of the far more general Proposition 4.5 below.

Proposition 4.4. *There is a continuous positive function $\delta : [0, \infty) \to (0, \infty)$ such that for any $w, \theta > 0$ there are $\tau = \tau(w), \overline{\rho} = \overline{\rho}(w) > 0$ and $K = K(w), T = T(w, \theta) < \infty$ such that:*
Let $\mathcal{M}$ be a Ricci flow with surgery on the time-interval $[0, \infty)$ with normalized initial conditions that is performed by $\delta(t)$-precise cutoff. Let $t_0 > T$ be a time, $x_0 \in \mathcal{M}(t_0)$ a point and $r_0 > 0$ and assume that

(i) $\theta\sqrt{t_0} \leq r_0 \leq \sqrt{t_0}$,
(ii) x_0 is w-good at scale r_0 and time t_0.

Then we have $\rho(x_0, t_0) > r_1 = \min\{\overline{\rho}\sqrt{t_0}, r_0\}$ and the parabolic neighborhood $P(x_0, t_0, r_1, -\tau r_1^2)$ is non-singular and $|\mathrm{Rm}| < K r_0^{-2}$ on $P(x_0, t_0, r_1, -\tau r_1^2)$.

Proof. The proof is very similar to that of Corollary 3.3. Choose the constants ε_0, $\underline{E}_{\varepsilon_0}$, $\underline{\eta}$ as well as the functions $\underline{r}_{\varepsilon_0}$, $\underline{\delta}_{\varepsilon_0}$, δ as described in the first paragraph of this proof. Then every point $(x, t) \in \mathcal{M}$ with $t \in [\frac{1}{2}t_0, t_0]$ satisfies the canonical neighborhood assumptions $CNA(\underline{r}_{\varepsilon_0}(t_0), \varepsilon_0, \underline{E}_{\varepsilon}, \underline{\eta})$. This implies that also every point $(x, t) \in \widetilde{\mathcal{M}}$ in the universal covering flow (see Lemma 4.2) with $t \in [\frac{1}{2}t_0, t_0]$ satisfies the same the canonical neighborhood assumptions $CNA(\underline{r}_{\varepsilon_0}(t_0), \varepsilon_0, \underline{E}_{\varepsilon_0}, \underline{\eta})$. As in the proof of Corollary, we can assume that $\delta(t) \leq \delta_{3.2}(\underline{r}_{\varepsilon_0}(t_0), w, 1, \underline{E}_{\varepsilon_0}, \underline{\eta}, 0)$ for all $t \in [\frac{1}{2}t_0, t_0]$ where $\delta_{3.2}$ is the constant from Proposition 3.2.

We now apply Proposition 3.2 to the universal covering flow $\widetilde{\mathcal{M}}$ at a lift $\widetilde{x}_0$ of x_0 with $x_0 \leftarrow \widetilde{x}_0$, $t_0 \leftarrow t_0$, $r_0 \leftarrow r_2 = \min\{\rho_{r_0}(x_0, t_0), \overline{r}_{3.2}\sqrt{t_0}, \frac{1}{2}\sqrt{t_0}\}$, $r \leftarrow \underline{r}_{\varepsilon_0}(t_0)$, $w \leftarrow w$, $A \leftarrow 1$, $E \leftarrow \underline{E}_{\varepsilon_0}$, $\eta \leftarrow \underline{\eta}$, $m \leftarrow 0$. Here $\overline{r}_{3.2} = \overline{r}_{3.2}(w, 1, \underline{E}_{\varepsilon_0}, \underline{\eta})$. So we obtain that if $r_2 = \rho(x_0, t_0)$, then $r_2 > \widehat{r}_{3.2}(w, 1, \underline{E}_{\varepsilon_0}, \underline{\eta})\sqrt{t_0}$. This implies that $\rho(x_0, t_0) > \min\{\min\{\widehat{r}_{3.2}, \overline{r}_{3.2}, \frac{1}{2}\}\sqrt{t_0}, r_0\}$ and hence the first claim for $\overline{\rho} = \min\{\widehat{r}_{3.2}, \overline{r}_{3.2}, \frac{1}{2}\}$.

Consider now the constant $C_{1,3.2} = C_{1,3.2}(w, 1, \underline{E}_{\varepsilon_0}, \underline{\eta})$ from Proposition 3.2 and assume that $T = T(w, \theta) > 1$ is chosen large enough to ensure that $C_{1,3.2}\delta(t) \leq$

$\min\{\overline{\rho},\theta\}$ for all $t \in [\frac{1}{2}t_0, t_0]$. Then in particular

$$C_{1,3.2}\delta(t) \leq \min\{\overline{\rho},\theta\}\sqrt{t_0} \leq \min\{\rho_{r_0}(x_0,t_0), \overline{r}_{3.2}\sqrt{t_0}, \tfrac{1}{2}\sqrt{t_0}\} = r_2$$

and hence by Proposition 3.2 we have $|\mathrm{Rm}| < K_{3.2}(w,1,\underline{E}_{\varepsilon_0},\underline{\eta})r_2^{-2}$ on $P(x_0,t_0,r_2, -\tau_{3.2}(w,1,\underline{E}_{\varepsilon_0},\underline{\eta})r_2^2)$ and this parabolic neighborhood is non-singular. □

4.5. **Bounded curvature at bounded distance from sufficiently collapsed and good regions.** We now extend the curvature bound from Proposition 4.4 to balls of larger radii Ar_0. It is crucial here that by assuming sufficient collapsedness around the basepoint (depending on A), we don't have to impose an assumption of the form $r_0 < \overline{r}(w,A)\sqrt{t_0}$ as in Proposition 3.2. So the product Ar_0 can indeed be chosen arbitrarily large.

Proposition 4.5. *There is a continuous positive function $\delta : [0,\infty) \to (0,\infty)$ such that for any $w,\theta > 0$ and $1 \leq A < \infty$ there are $\tau = \tau(w), \overline{\rho} = \overline{\rho}(w,A), \overline{w} = \overline{w}(w,A) > 0$ and $K(w,A), T(w,A,\theta) < \infty$ such that:*
Let $\mathcal{M}$ be a Ricci flow with surgery on the time-interval $[0,\infty)$ with normalized initial conditions that is performed by $\delta(t)$-precise cutoff and let $t_0 > T$. Choose $x_0 \in \mathcal{M}(t_0)$ and $r_0 > 0$ and assume that

(i) $\theta\sqrt{t_0} \leq r_0 \leq \sqrt{t_0}$,
(ii) x_0 *is w-good at scale r_0 and time t_0,*
(iii) $\mathrm{vol}_{t_0} B(x_0,t_0,r_0) < \overline{w}r_0^3$.

Then $|\mathrm{Rm}| < Kr_0^{-2}$ on $B = \bigcup_{t\in[t_0-\tau r_0^2,t_0]} B(x_0,t,Ar_0)$ and there are no surgery points on B.

In particular, if $r_0 \geq \rho(x_0,t_0)$, then $\rho(x_0,t_0) > \overline{\rho}\sqrt{t_0}$ and the curvature estimate becomes $|\mathrm{Rm}| < Kt_0^{-1}$.

Proof. We first set up an argument in the spirit of the proof of Corollary 3.3. Choose $\varepsilon_0 > 0$ to be smaller than the corresponding constant in Lemma 3.10 and the constant $\widetilde{\varepsilon}_0$ in Lemma 4.3. By Proposition 2.15 there are constants $0 < \eta < \underline{\eta}$, $\underline{E}_{\varepsilon_0} < E < \infty$ and decreasing continuous positive functions $\underline{r}_{\varepsilon_0}, \underline{\delta}_{\varepsilon_0} : [0,\infty) \to (0,\infty)$ such that if $\delta(t) \leq \underline{\delta}_{\varepsilon_0}(t)$ for all $t \in [0,\infty)$, then every point $(x,t) \in \mathcal{M}$ satisfies the canonical neighborhood assumptions $CNA(\underline{r}_{\varepsilon_0}(t),\varepsilon_0,E,\eta)$. Without loss of generality, we can assume that $E > E_{0,3.10}(\varepsilon_0)$ and $\eta < \eta_{0,3.10}$ where $E_{0,3.10}$ and $\eta_{0,3.10}$ are the constants from Lemma 3.10. Consider the constant $\delta_{3.10}(w',A',r',\varepsilon',E',\eta')$, assume that it depends on its parameters w',A',r' in a monotone way, i.e. $\delta_{3.10}(w'',A'',r'',\varepsilon',E',\eta') \leq \delta_{3.10}(w',A',r',\varepsilon',E',\eta')$ whenever $w'' \leq w'$, $A'' \geq A'$ and $r'' \leq r'$, and assume that for all $t \geq 0$

$$\delta(t) < \min\left\{\delta_{3.10}(t^{-1},t,\underline{r}_{\varepsilon_0}(2t),\varepsilon_0,E,\eta),\ \underline{\delta}_{\varepsilon_0}(t),\ \delta_{4.4}(t)\right\}.$$

By Proposition 4.4, we have $\rho(x_0,t_0) > r_1 = \min\{\overline{\rho}_{4.4}(w)\sqrt{t_0}, r_0\}$ and $|\mathrm{Rm}| < K_{4.4}(w)r_0^{-2}$ on the non-singular parabolic neighborhood $P(x_0,t_0,r_1,-\tau_{4.4}(w)r_1^2)$ (here we need to assume that T is large enough). In particular, this shows how the last assertion of the Proposition follows from the first one.

It remains to provec the first assertion. Consider the constants $\tau_{4.4}(w)$, $K_{4.4}(w)$ from Proposition 4.4 and set

$$\gamma = \gamma(w) = \tfrac{1}{10}\min\big\{1, \tau_{4.4}^{1/2}(w), K_{4.4}^{-1/2}(w)\big\}.$$

Consider the universal covering flow $\widetilde{\mathcal{M}}$ of $\mathcal{M}$ as described in Lemma 4.2 and let $\widetilde{x}_0 \in \widetilde{\mathcal{M}}$ be a lift of x_0. By the choice of γ we have

$$|\mathrm{Rm}| < (\gamma r_0)^{-2} \quad \text{on} \quad P(\widetilde{x}_0, t, \gamma r_0, -(\gamma r_0)^2) \quad \text{for all} \quad t \in [t_0 - (\gamma r_0)^2, t_0]$$

and $\mathrm{vol}_t B(\widetilde{x}_0, t, \gamma r_0) > \frac{1}{10}\widetilde{c}(\gamma r_0)^3$ for all such t. We now argue that for sufficiently large T we can apply Lemma 3.10(a) with $\mathcal{M} \leftarrow \widetilde{\mathcal{M}}$, $\widetilde{x}_0 \leftarrow x_0$, $t_0 \leftarrow t \in [t_0-(\gamma r_0)^2, t_0]$, $r_0 \leftarrow \gamma r_0$, $w \leftarrow \frac{1}{10}\widetilde{c}w$, $A \leftarrow \gamma^{-1}(A+1)$, $r \leftarrow \underline{r}_{\varepsilon_0}(t_0)$, $\eta \leftarrow \eta$, $\varepsilon \leftarrow \varepsilon_0$, $E \leftarrow E$. In order to do this, we need to assume that $T = T(w, A, \theta)$ is large enough such that $2T^{-1} < \frac{1}{10}\widetilde{c}w$ and $\frac{1}{2}T > \gamma^{-1}(A+1)$. Observe that for all $(x', t') \in \mathcal{M}$ with $[\frac{1}{2}t_0, t_0]$ the canonical neighborhood assumptions $CNA(\underline{r}_\varepsilon(t_0), \varepsilon_0, E, \eta)$ hold. So these canonical neighborhood assumptions also hold for all $(x', t') \in \widetilde{\mathcal{M}}$ with $t' \in [\frac{1}{2}t_0, t_0]$. Moreover, by the choice of T we have $\delta(t') < \delta_{3.10}(\widetilde{c}w, \gamma^{-1}(A+1), \underline{r}_{\varepsilon_0}(t_0), \varepsilon_0, E, \eta)$ for all $t' \in [\frac{1}{2}t_0, t_0]$. So Lemma 3.10(a) can be applied and we conclude that for any $t \in [t_0 - (\gamma r_0)^2, t_0]$ the points on $B(\widetilde{x}_0, t, (A+1)r_0)$ satisfy the canonical neighborhood assumptions $CNA(\gamma\widetilde{\rho}_{3.10}r_0, \varepsilon_0, E, \eta)$. Here $\widetilde{\rho}_{3.10} = \widetilde{\rho}_{3.10}(\frac{1}{10}\widetilde{c}w, \gamma^{-1}(A+1), \varepsilon_0, E, \eta)$. Set $K = \gamma^{-2}\max\{\widetilde{\rho}_{3.10}^{-2}, E^2\}$. So, whenever $|\mathrm{Rm}|(x,t) \geq Kr_0^{-2}$ for some $x \in B(\widetilde{x}_0, t, (A+1)r_0)$, then (x,t) is a center of a strong ε_0-neck or an (ε_0, E)-cap and

$$|\nabla|\mathrm{Rm}|^{-1/2}|(x,t) < \eta^{-1}. \tag{4.1}$$

Fix some $t \in [t_0 - (\gamma r_0)^2, t_0]$. Let $a \leq A$ be maximal with the property that $|\mathrm{Rm}_t| < Kr_0^{-2}$ on $B(\widetilde{x}_0, t, ar_0)$. If $a = A$, we are done, so assume $a < A$. By (4.1), we can conclude that (compare also with Lemma 3.5)

$$|\mathrm{Rm}_t| < 4Kr_0^{-2} \qquad \text{on} \qquad B(\widetilde{x}_0, t, ar_0 + \tfrac{1}{2}\eta K^{-1/2}r_0). \tag{4.2}$$

By the choice of a we can find a point $\widetilde{x}_1 \in \widetilde{\mathcal{M}}(t)$ of time-t distance exactly ar_0 from $\widetilde{x}_0$ with $|\mathrm{Rm}|(\widetilde{x}_1, t) = Kr_0^{-2}$. So $(\widetilde{x}_1, t_0)$ is either a center an ε_0-neck or an (ε_0, E)-cap in $\widetilde{\mathcal{M}}(t)$.

Let $x_1 \in \mathcal{M}(t)$ be the projection of $\widetilde{x}_1$. By (4.2) and volume comparison, we can crudely estimate

$$\begin{aligned}\mathrm{vol}_t B(x_1, t, \tfrac{1}{2}\eta K^{-1/2}r_0) &< \mathrm{vol}_t B(x_0, t, ar_0 + \tfrac{1}{2}\eta K^{-1/2}r_0) \\ &< C(A,K)\,\mathrm{vol}_t B(x_0, t, r_0) < C(w, A)\overline{w}r_0^3. \end{aligned} \tag{4.3}$$

If $(\widetilde{x}_1, t)$ is a center of an ε_0-neck, then we obtain a contradiction using Lemma 4.3 assuming $C(w,A)\overline{w} < \widetilde{w}_0(\frac{1}{2}\eta K^{-1/2})^3$. So assume for the rest of the proof that $(\widetilde{x}_1, t)$ is a center of an (ε_0, E)-cap $U \subset \widetilde{\mathcal{M}}(t)$. Let $K \subset U$ be a compact subset such that $\widetilde{x}_1 \in K$ and $U \setminus K$ is an ε_0-neck and let $\widetilde{y} \in U$ be a center of this neck. We have $\gamma^{-2}r_0^{-2} \leq E^{-2}Kr_0^{-2} \leq |\mathrm{Rm}| \leq E^2Kr_0^{-2}$ on U. So $\widetilde{x}_0 \notin U$ and hence the minimizing geodesic segment between $\widetilde{x}_0$ and $\widetilde{x}_1$ passes through the whole ε_0-neck

$U \setminus K$. So for sufficiently small ε_0 we have $\mathrm{dist}_t(\widetilde{x}_0, \widetilde{y}) < \mathrm{dist}_t(\widetilde{x}_0, \widetilde{x}_1) = ar_0$. In particular, for the projection y of $\widetilde{y}$ we find $B(y, t, \frac{1}{2}\eta K^{-1/2} r_0) \subset B(x_0, t, ar_0 + \frac{1}{2}\eta K^{-1/2} r_0)$. Now again using Lemma 4.3 and (4.3), we conclude

$$\widetilde{w}_0 \big(\tfrac{1}{2}\eta E^{-1} K^{-1/2}\big)^3 r_0^3 < \mathrm{vol}_t\, B(y, t, \tfrac{1}{2}\eta E^{-1} K^{-1/2} r_0) < C(w, A)\overline{w} r_0^3.$$

This yields a contradiction for sufficiently small $\overline{w}$, depending on w and A.

It remains to show that there are no surgery points on B. To see this, observe that $|\mathrm{Rm}| < K\theta^{-2} t_0^{-2}$ on B, but by (3.2) we have $|\mathrm{Rm}|(x,t) > c'\delta^{-2}(t)$ at for every surgery point $(x,t) \in \mathcal{M}$ for some universal $c' > 0$. So choosing T large enough yields the desired result. □

4.6. **Curvature control at points that are good relatively to regions whose boundary is geometrically controlled.** Next, we generalize Proposition 4.4 to include points that are good relatively to some open set U. In order to do this, we need to assume that the metric around the boundary of U is sufficiently controlled on a time-interval of uniform size.

Proposition 4.6. *There is a continuous positive function $\delta : [0,\infty) \to (0,\infty)$ such that for any $w, \theta > 0$ there are $\alpha = \alpha(w), \widehat{r} = \widehat{r}(w) > 0$ and $K = K(w), T = T(w,\theta) < \infty$ such that:*
Let $\mathcal{M}$ be a Ricci flow with surgery on the time-interval $[0,\infty)$ with normalized initial conditions which is performed by $\delta(t)$-precise cutoff and let $t_0 > T$. Let $r_0 > 0$ and consider a sub-Ricci flow with surgery $U \subset \mathcal{M}$ (see Definition 2.5) on the time-interval $[t_0 - r_0^2, t_0]$ whose time-slices $U(t)$ are closed subsets of $\mathcal{M}(t)$ and a point $x_0 \in U(t_0)$ such that

(i) $\theta\sqrt{t_0} < r_0 \le \sqrt{t_0}$,
(ii) for all $x \in \partial U(t_0)$, the parabolic neighborhood $P(x, t_0, r_0, -r_0^2)$ is non-singular and we have $|\mathrm{Rm}| < r_0^{-2}$ there,
(iii) x_0 is w-good at scale r_0 relatively to $U(t_0)$ at time t_0.

Then the parabolic neighborhood $P(x_0, t_0, \alpha r_0, -\alpha^2 r_0^2)$ is non-singular and we have $|\mathrm{Rm}| < K r_0^{-2}$ there.

Proof. The idea of the proof will be to apply Proposition 3.2 to the universal covering flow $\widetilde{U}$ of U (see Lemma 4.2). So our main task will be to verify assumptions (i) and (ii) of that Proposition. Besides that, the proof essentially follows along the lines of the proof of Proposition 4.4.

We first choose the function $\delta(t)$. Let $\varepsilon_0 > 0$ be the constant from Proposition 3.2 and consider the constants $\underline{E}_{\varepsilon_0}$, $\underline{\eta}$ and the functions $\underline{\delta}_{\varepsilon_0}(t), \underline{r}_{\varepsilon_0}(t)$ from Proposition 2.15. So if $\delta(t) < \underline{\delta}_{\varepsilon_0}(t)$ for all $t \ge 0$, then $\mathcal{M}$ satisfies the canonical neighborhood assumptions $CNA(\underline{r}_{\varepsilon_0}(t), \varepsilon_0, \underline{E}_{\varepsilon_0}, \underline{\eta})$. Without loss of generality, we assume that $\underline{r}_{\varepsilon_0}(t) \to 0$ as $t \to \infty$. Similarly as in the proof of Proposition 4.4 or Corollary 3.3, we assume that

$$\delta(t) < \min\big\{\delta_{3.2}(\underline{r}_{\varepsilon_0}(2t), t^{-1}, 1, \underline{E}_{\varepsilon_0}, \underline{\eta}, 0),\ \underline{\delta}_{\varepsilon_0}(t),\ 1\big\}$$

where $\delta_{3.2}$ is the constant in Proposition 3.2, which we assume to satisfy the before-mentioned monotonicity property. Furthermore, we choose $T = T(w,\theta)$

such that $2T^{-1} < \widetilde{c}w$ and that $\underline{r}_{\varepsilon_0}(t) < \frac{1}{20}\theta \min\{1, E^{-1}, \varepsilon_0\}\sqrt{t}$, $\delta(t) < \frac{1}{2}\theta\sqrt{t}$ for all $t \geq \frac{1}{2}T$.

We now present the main argument. By assumption (ii), we can consider the case in which $B(x_0, t_0, r_0) \subset U(t_0)$. Our goal will be to apply Proposition 3.2 in the universal covering flow $\widetilde{U}$ of U (see Lemma 4.2) at a lift $(\widetilde{x}_0, t_0)$ of (x_0, t_0). We first check that all points $(x,t) \in \widetilde{U}$ with $t \in [t_0 - \frac{1}{2}r_0^2, t_0]$ satisfy the canonical neighborhood assumptions $CNA(\underline{r}_{\varepsilon_0}(t_0), \varepsilon_0, \underline{E}_{\varepsilon_0}, \underline{\eta})$. To do this, consider first a point $(x,t) \in U \subset \mathcal{M}$ with $t \in [t_0 - \frac{1}{2}r_0^2, t_0] \subset [\frac{1}{2}t_0, t_0]$. By the previous conclusion, (x,t) satisfies the desired canonical neighborhood assumptions in $\mathcal{M}$. We now argue that (x,t) satisfies those canonical neighborhood assumptions also in U. If $|\mathrm{Rm}|^{-1/2}(x,t) > \underline{r}_{\varepsilon_0}(t_0)$, then there is nothing to show. So assume that

$$|\mathrm{Rm}|^{-1/2}(x,t) \leq \underline{r}_{\varepsilon_0}(t_0) < \tfrac{1}{20}\theta \min\{1, E^{-1}, \varepsilon_0\}\sqrt{t_0} < \tfrac{1}{10}\big(\max\{1, E, 2\varepsilon_0^{-1}\}\big)^{-1} r_0.$$

Then in particular $|\mathrm{Rm}|(x,t) > r_0^{-2}$, which implies by assumption (ii) that $(x,t) \notin P(x', t_0, r_0, -r_0^2)$ for all $x' \in \partial U(t_0)$ and hence $B(x, t, \frac{1}{10}r_0) \subset U(t)$. The point (x,t) is a center of a strong ε_0-neck or an (ε_0, E)-cap in $\mathcal{M}$. The time-t slice of this strong ε_0-neck or (ε_0, E)-cap is contained in the ball

$$B\big(x, t, \max\{E, 2\varepsilon_0^{-1}\}|\mathrm{Rm}|^{-1/2}(x,t)\big) \subset B(x, t, \tfrac{1}{10}r_0) \subset U(t).$$

Moreover, if (x,t) is the center of a strong ε_0-neck, then this neck reaches at most until time $t - 2|\mathrm{Rm}|^{-1}(x,t) > t_0 - \frac{1}{2}r_0^2 - \frac{1}{50}r_0^2 > t - r_0^2$. So (x,t) in fact satisfies the canonical neighborhood assumptions $CNA(\underline{r}_{\varepsilon_0}(t_0), \varepsilon_0, \underline{E}_{\varepsilon_0}, \underline{\eta})$ in U. It follows that all points $(x,t) \in \widetilde{U}$ with $t \in [t_0 - \frac{1}{2}r_0^2, t_0]$ satisfy those canonical neighborhood assumptions in $\widetilde{U}$.

Note that all surgeries on $\widetilde{U}$ in the time-interval $[t_0 - \frac{1}{2}r_0^2, t_0]$ are performed by $\delta_{3.2}(\underline{r}_{\varepsilon_0}(t_0), \widetilde{c}w, 1, \underline{E}_{\varepsilon_0}, \underline{\eta}, 0)$-precise cutoff. So the first paragraph of the assumptions as well as assumption (iv) and (v) of Proposition 3.2 is satisfied for $\mathcal{M} \leftarrow \widetilde{U}$, $t_0 \leftarrow t_0$, $x_0 \leftarrow \widetilde{x}_0$, $r_0 \leftarrow r_1$, $w \leftarrow \widetilde{c}w$, $A \leftarrow 1$, $r \leftarrow \underline{r}_{\varepsilon_0}(t_0)$, $E \leftarrow \underline{E}_{\varepsilon_0}$, $\eta \leftarrow \underline{\eta}$ whenever $r_1 \leq \min\{\rho(x_0, t_0), \frac{1}{2}r_0\}$. We will now argue that assumptions (i) and (ii) are satisfied for the right choice of r_1, i.e. we show that there is a constant $\beta = \beta(w) > 0$ (depending only on w) such that these assumptions hold whenever $r_1 \leq \beta r_0$.

Consider first assumption (ii). Let $x \in B(\widetilde{x}_0, t_0, \beta r_0)$ be a point that survives until some time $t \in [t_0 - \frac{1}{10}\beta^2 r_0^2, t_0]$. Then $\mathrm{dist}_{t_0}(x, \partial\widetilde{U}(t_0)) > \frac{1}{2}r_0$ for $\beta < \frac{1}{2}$ and we conclude that $\mathrm{dist}_t(x, \partial\widetilde{U}(t)) > \frac{1}{20}r_0$. So assumption (ii) holds if $\beta < \frac{1}{200}$.

Assumption (i) requires more work. Set $Z = Z_{3.2}(\widetilde{c}w, 1, \underline{E}_{\varepsilon_0}, \underline{\eta})$. Let $t_1, t_2 \in [t_0 - \frac{1}{10}\beta^2 r_0^2, t_0]$, $t_1 < t_2$ and consider some point $x \in B(\widetilde{x}_0, t_0, \beta r_0)$ that survives until time t_2 and a space-time curve $\gamma : [t_1, t_2] \to \mathcal{M}$ with endpoint $\gamma(t_2) \in B(x, t, 4\beta r_0)$ and that meets the boundary $\partial\widetilde{U}$. We want to show that for a sufficiently small choice of β we have $\mathcal{L}(\gamma) > Z\beta r_0$. Similarly as in the last

paragraph, we conclude that $\mathrm{dist}_{t_0}(\gamma(t_2), \partial\widetilde{U}(t_0)) > \frac{1}{2}r_0$ if $\beta < \frac{1}{100}$. Let now

$$P = \bigcup_{x' \in \partial\widetilde{U}(t_0)} P(x', t_0, \tfrac{1}{2}r_0, -r_0^2)$$

be a parabolic collar neighborhood of $\partial\widetilde{U}$. Recall that P is non-singular, $|\mathrm{Rm}| < r_0^{-2}$ on P and $(\gamma(t_2), t_2) \notin P$. Let $[t_1', t_2'] \subset [t_1, t_2]$ be a time-interval such that $\gamma(t_1') \in \partial\widetilde{U}(t_1')$ and $\mathrm{dist}_{t_0}(\gamma(t_2'), \partial\widetilde{U}'(t_2')) > \frac{1}{2}r_0$ and such that $\gamma([t_1', t_2')) \subset P$. Then we can estimate using the t^{-1}-positivity condition

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{L}(\gamma) \geq \int_{t_1}^{t_2} \sqrt{t_2 - t}\big(|\gamma'(t)|_t^2 - \tfrac{3}{2}t^{-1}\big)dt &\geq \int_{t_1'}^{t_2'} \sqrt{t_2 - t}\,|\gamma'(t)|_t^2 dt - \tfrac{3}{2}\beta r_0 \\ &\geq c\int_{t_1'}^{t_2'} \sqrt{t_2' - t}|\gamma'(t)|_{t_0}^2 dt - \tfrac{3}{2}\beta r_0.\end{aligned}$$

Substituting $s^2 = t_2' - t$ with $s_1^2 = t_2' - t_1'$ yields

$$\begin{aligned}\int_{t_1'}^{t_2'} \sqrt{t_2' - t}|\gamma'(t)|_{t_0}^2 dt &= \tfrac{1}{2}\int_0^{s_1} \Big|\frac{d}{ds}\gamma(t_2' - s^2)\Big|_{t_0}^2 ds \\ &\geq \frac{1}{2\sqrt{t_2' - t_1'}}\,\mathrm{dist}_{t_0}^2(\gamma(t_2'), \gamma(t_1')) \geq \frac{r_0^2}{8\sqrt{t_2' - t_1'}} \geq \frac{1}{8\beta}r_0.\end{aligned}$$

Thus

$$\mathcal{L}(\gamma) > \Big(\frac{c}{8\beta} - \tfrac{3}{2}\beta\Big)r_0.$$

For sufficiently small β, the right hand side is larger than $Z\beta r_0$.

We can finally apply Proposition 3.2 with the parameters mentioned above and $r_1 = \min\{\rho(x_0, t_0), \min\{\beta, \overline{r}_{3.2}(\widetilde{c}w, 1, \underline{E}_{\varepsilon_0}, \underline{\eta})\}r_0\}$. We first obtain, that there is an $\widehat{r}_1 = \widehat{r}_1(w) > 0$ such that $r_1 > \widehat{r}_1 r_0$. Consider moreover the constant $C_{1,3.2} = C_{1,3.2}(\widetilde{c}w, 1, \underline{E}_{\varepsilon_0}, \underline{\eta})$ from Proposition 3.2. Assuming T to be large enough, we conclude $C_{1,3.2}\delta(t) \leq C_{1,3.2} \leq \widehat{r}_1\theta\sqrt{t_0} < \widehat{r}_1 r_0 < r_1$ for all $t \in [\frac{1}{2}t_0, t_0]$. This implies that the parabolic neighborhood $P(\widetilde{x}_0, t_0, r_1, -\tau_{3.2}(\widetilde{c}w, 1, \underline{E}_{\varepsilon_0}, \underline{\eta})r_1^2)$ is non-singular and that we have $|\mathrm{Rm}| < K_{0,3.2}(\widetilde{c}w, 1, \underline{E}_{\varepsilon_0}, \underline{\eta})r_1^{-2}$ there, hence finishing the proof. □

4.7. **Controlled diameter growth of regions whose boundary is sufficiently collapsed and good.** In this subsection we show that if a region U in a Ricci flow with surgery has bounded diameter at some time t_1, then we can bound its curvature and diameter from above at some slightly later time $t_2 > t_1$ if the geometry around the boundary ∂U satisfies certain collapsedness and goodness assumptions. The important point is hereby that the size of the time-interval $[t_1, t_2]$ does not depend on the diameter of U at time t_1. We are able to guarantee this independence by imposing a collapsedness condition, which depends on the diameter of U at time t_1. Note the opposite statement is most likely wrong, namely a bound on the diameter of U at time t_1, does not necessarily imply a

bound on the diameter at *earlier* times $t_2 < t_1$, even under very strong collapsedness assumptions. For example, if we consider a parabolic rescaling of the cigar soliton, with a very small scaling factor, then the diameter of a region around its tip contracts arbitrarily fast under the Ricci flow. The statement of the following proposition is that in certain settings diameters however cannot "*expand* too fast".

The idea of the following proof is that by an $\mathcal{L}$-geometry argument similar to Lemma 3.6, we can deduce a κ-noncollapsedness result where the constant κ only depends on the diameter of U at *time* t_1. Then an argument similar to the one in the proof of Lemma 3.10(b) will help us derive more uniform canonical neighborhood assumptions on U and finally an argument similar to the one in the proof of Proposition 4.5 will yield a curvature bound on U.

Proposition 4.7. *There is a continuous positive function $\delta : [0,\infty) \to (0,\infty)$ and for every $w > 0$ there is a $\tau_0 = \tau_0(w) > 0$ such that for all $\theta > 0$ and $A < \infty$ there are constants $\kappa = \kappa(w,A), \widetilde{\rho} = \widetilde{\rho}(w,A), \overline{w} = \overline{w}(w,A) > 0$ and $K = K(w,A), A' = A'(w,A), T = T(w,A,\theta) < \infty$ such that:*
Let $\mathcal{M}$ be a Ricci flow with surgery on the time-interval $[0,\infty)$ with normalized initial conditions that is performed by $\delta(t)$-precise cutoff and let $t_0 > T$. Let $\tau \in (0,\tau_0]$ and consider a sub-Ricci flow with surgery $U \subset \mathcal{M}$ on the time-interval $[t_0 - \tau r_0^2, t_0]$ whose time-slices are connected. Let $x_0 \in U(t_0)$ be a point that survives until time $t_0 - \tau r_0^2$ and $r_0 > 0$ be a constant. Assume that

(i) $\theta\sqrt{t_0} < r_0 \leq \sqrt{t_0}$,
(ii) x_0 *is w-good at scale r_0 and time t_0,*
(iii) $\mathrm{vol}_{t_0} B(x_0, t_0, r_0) < \overline{w} r_0^3$,
(iv) $\partial U(t) \subset B(x_0, t, Ar_0)$ *for all* $t \in [t_0 - \tau r_0^2, t_0]$,
(v) $U(t_0 - \tau r_0^2) \subset B(x_0, t_0 - \tau r_0^2, Ar_0)$.

Consider the universal covering flow $\widetilde{\mathcal{M}}$ of $\mathcal{M}$ as described in Lemma 4.2 and let $\widetilde{U} \subset \widetilde{\mathcal{M}}$ be a sub-Ricci flow with surgery such that $\widetilde{U}(t) \subset \widetilde{\mathcal{M}}(t)$ is a family of lifts of $U(t)$. Then

(a) For all $t \in [t_0 - \tau r_0^2, t_0]$ all points of $\widetilde{U}(t)$ are κ-noncollapsed on scales $< r_0$ in $\widetilde{\mathcal{M}}$.
(b) There are universal constants $\eta > 0$, $E < \infty$ such that for every $t \in [t_0 - \tau r_0^2, t_0]$ the points in $\widetilde{U}(t)$ satisfy the canonical neighborhood assumptions $CNA(\widetilde{\rho} r_0, \widetilde{\varepsilon}_0, E, \eta)$ in $\widetilde{\mathcal{M}}$. Here $\widetilde{\varepsilon}_0$ is the constant from Lemma 4.3.
(c) There are no surgery points in U (i.e. the Ricci flow with surgery U is non-singular and we can write $U = U(t_0) \times [t_0 - \tau r_0^2, t_0]$) and we have $|\mathrm{Rm}| < K r_0^{-2}$ on $U(t_0) \times [t_0 - \tau r_0^2, t_0]$.
(d) $U(t) \subset B(x_0, t, A' r_0)$ for all $t \in [t_0 - \tau r_0^2, t_0]$.

Proof. Consider the functions $\underline{\delta}_{\widetilde{\varepsilon}_0}(t), \underline{r}_{\widetilde{\varepsilon}_0}(t)$ and the constants $\underline{E}_{\widetilde{\varepsilon}_0}, \underline{\eta}$ from Proposition 2.15 ($\widetilde{\varepsilon}_0$ is the constant from Lemma 4.3) and the function $\delta_{4.5}(t)$ from Proposition 4.5. Let furthermore $\delta^*(\Lambda, r, \eta, t_0)$ be the function from Claim 2 in the proof of Lemma 3.6. We can assume without loss of generality that δ^* is

monotone in the sense that $\delta^*(\Lambda', r', \eta) \leq \delta^*(\Lambda, r, \eta)$ whenever $\Lambda' \geq \Lambda$ and $r' \leq r$. Assume now that for all $t \geq 0$

$$\delta(t) < \min\big\{\delta^*(t, \tfrac{1}{2}\underline{r}_{\widetilde{\varepsilon}_0}(2t), \underline{\eta}),\ \underline{\delta}_{\widetilde{\varepsilon}_0}(t),\ \delta_{4.5}(t),\ t^{-1}\underline{r}_{\widetilde{\varepsilon}_0}(2t)\big\}.$$

We note that then the flows $\mathcal{M}$ and $\widetilde{\mathcal{M}}$ satisfy the canonical neighborhood assumptions $CNA(\underline{r}_{\widetilde{\varepsilon}_0}(t), \widetilde{\varepsilon}_0, \underline{E}_{\widetilde{\varepsilon}_0}, \underline{\eta})$.

Set $\tau_0(w) = \frac{1}{2}\tau_{4.5}(w)$ and assume that $\overline{w} < \overline{w}_{4.5}(w, 2A)$ and $T > T_{4.5}(w, 2A, \theta)$ where $\tau_{4.5}$, $\overline{w}_{4.5}$ and $T_{4.5}$ are the constants from Propsition 4.5. Then there is a constant $0 < \tau' = \tau'(w, A) < \tau$ such that the parabolic neighborhood $P(x_0, t_0 - \tau r_0^2, Ar_0, -\tau' r_0^2)$ is non-singular and

$$|\mathrm{Rm}| < K_1^*(w, A) r_0^{-2} \qquad \text{on} \qquad P(x_0, t_0 - \tau r_0^2, Ar_0, -\tau' r_0^2) \tag{4.4}$$

and such that the distance distortion on $P(x_0, t_0 - \tau r_0^2, Ar_0, -\tau' r_0^2)$ can be controlled by a factor of 2, i.e. $U(t) \subset B(x_0, t, 2Ar_0)$ for all $t \in [t_0 - \tau r_0^2, t_0 - (\tau + \tau')r_0^2]$ (note that since the previous parabolic neighborhood is non-singular, we can extend U to the time-interval $[t_0 - (\tau + \tau')r_0^2, t_0]$). Moreover, we obtain the bound

$$|\mathrm{Rm}| < K_1^*(w, A) r_0^{-2} \qquad \text{on} \qquad B = \bigcup_{t \in [t_0 - (\tau + \tau')r_0^2, t_0]} B(x_0, t, 2Ar_0) \tag{4.5}$$

and we can assume that there are no surgery points in B.

Proof of assertion (a). We follow a modified version of the proof of Lemma 3.6. Let $t_1 \in [t_0 - \tau r_0^2, t_0]$, $\widetilde{x}_1 \in \widetilde{U}(t_1) \subset \widetilde{\mathcal{M}}(t_1)$, $0 < r_1 < r_0$ such that $P(\widetilde{x}_1, t_1, r_1, -r_1^2)$ is non-singular and $|\mathrm{Rm}| < r_1^{-2}$ on $P(\widetilde{x}_1, t_1, r_1, -r_1^2)$.

We first explain that for sufficiently large T we can restrict ourselves to the case $r_1 > \frac{1}{2}\underline{r}_{\widetilde{\varepsilon}_0}(t_1) \geq \frac{1}{2}\underline{r}_{\widetilde{\varepsilon}_0}(t_0)$. Compare this statement with Claim 1 in the proof of Lemma 3.6 (applied to $\widetilde{\mathcal{M}}$). As in the proof of this claim, we chose $s > 0$ to be the supremum over all r_1 that satisfy the properties above and if $s \leq \frac{1}{2}\underline{r}_{\widetilde{\varepsilon}_0}(t_1)$, we argue as in the cases (2),(3). Case (1) does not occur since $\widetilde{\mathcal{M}}$ has no boundary and case (4) does not occur since we can assume that $s \leq \frac{1}{2}\underline{r}_{\widetilde{\varepsilon}_0}(t_1) \leq \theta\sqrt{t_0} < r_0$.

Let $x_1 \in \mathcal{M}(t_1)$ be the projection of $\widetilde{x}_1$. Consider the functions L, $\overline{L}$ and the family of domains D_t on $\mathcal{M}$ based in (x_1, t_1). Our first goal will be to show that $L(x_0, t_0 - (\tau + \frac{1}{2}\tau')r_0^2) < C_3 r_0$ for some univsersal $C_3 = C_3(w, A, a, \tau) < \infty$. An important tool will hereby be the following claim, which is analogous to Claim 2 in the proof of Lemma 3.6:

Claim. *For any $\Lambda < \infty$ there is a $T^* = T^*(\Lambda) < \infty$ such that whenever $t_0 \geq T^*$, then the following holds: If $t \in [t_0 - (\tau + \tau')r_0^2, t_1)$, $x \in \mathcal{M}(t)$, $r_1 > \frac{1}{2}\underline{r}_{\widetilde{\varepsilon}_0}(t_0)$ and $L(x, t) \leq \Lambda r_0$, then $x \in D_t$ and (x, t) is not a surgery point.*

Proof. This follows by the choice of δ in (4.5) along with Claim 2 in the proof of Lemma 3.6 (applied to $\mathcal{M}$). □

In contrast to the proof of Lemma 3.6, we don't need to localize the function $\overline{L}$. So we will make use of the inequality

$$\Big(\frac{\partial}{\partial t^-} - \triangle\Big)\overline{L}(x, t) \geq -6, \tag{4.6}$$

which holds on D_t in the barrier sense (cf [Per1, 7.1]). We will now apply a maximum principle argument to (4.6) to show that either $\inf_{U(t)} \overline{L}(\cdot,t) \leq 6(t_1-t)$ for all $t \in [t_0 - \tau r_0^2, t_1)$ or there is a $t \in [t_0 - \tau r_0^2, t_1)$ such that $\inf_{\partial U(t)} \overline{L}(\cdot,t) \leq 6(t_1-t)$. Assume not. Since, $\overline{L}(x_1,t) \sim \text{const}(t_1-t)^2$ as $t \to t_1$, there is some $t' \in [t_0 - \tau r_0^2, t_1)$ such that $\inf_{U(t)} \overline{L}(\cdot,t) \leq 6(t_1-t)$ for all $t \in [t', t_1)$. Choose $\nu > 0$ small enough such that $\inf_{\partial U(t)} \overline{L}(\cdot,t) > (6+\nu)(t_1-t)$ for all $t \in [t_0 - \tau r_0^2, t']$ and choose $t^* \in [t_0 - \tau r_0^2, t']$ minimal with the property that $\inf_{U(t)} \overline{L}(\cdot,t) \leq (6+\nu)(t_1-t)$ for all $t \in (t^*, t_1)$. So $\overline{L}(\cdot, t^*)$ attains its minimum at an interior point $x^* \in U(t^*)$. This implies that $\triangle \overline{L}(x^*, t^*) \geq 0$. Since $\overline{L}(x^*,t^*) \leq (6+\nu)(t_1-t^*)$, we have $L(x^*,t^*) \leq (3+\nu)\sqrt{t_1-t^*} \leq 4r_0$. Hence by the Claim, assuming $T \geq T^*(4)$, we conclude $x^* \in D_{t^*}$ and (x^*,t^*) is not a surgery point. By the assumption on t^*, we must then either have $t^* = t_0 - \tau r_0^2$ or $\overline{L}(x^*,t^*) = (6+\nu)(t_1-t^*)$ and $\frac{\partial}{\partial t}\overline{L}(x^*,t^*) \leq -6$, which however contradicts (4.6). So $\inf_{U(t)} \overline{L}(\cdot,t) \leq (6+\nu)(t_1-t)$ holds for all $\nu > 0$ and $t \in [t_0 - \tau r_0^2, t_1)$ and by letting ν go to zero, we obtain a contradiction.

Consider now the case in which there is a $t \in [t_0 - \tau r_0^2, t_1)$ such that $\inf_{\partial U(t)} \overline{L}(\cdot,t) \leq 6(t_1-t)$. Let $x \in \partial U(t)$ such that $\overline{L}(x,t) \leq 6(t_1-t)$, i.e. $L(x,t) \leq 3\sqrt{t_1-t} \leq 3r_0$. By concatenating an $\mathcal{L}$-geodesic between (x_1,t_1) and (x,t) with a constant space-time curve on the time-interval $[t_0 - \tau r_0^2, t]$, we conclude using (4.5) and assumption (iv)

$$L(x, t_0 - \tau r_0^2) \leq L(x,t) + C_1 K_1^* r_0^{-2} \int_t^{t_0 - \tau r_0^2} \sqrt{t_1 - t'} dt' \leq 3r_0 + C_1 K_1^* r_0.$$

Thus, in both cases (i.e. in the case in which the infimum of $\overline{L}$ can be controlled on the boundary of U as well as in the case in which it can be controlled everywhere on U), we can find some point $y \in U(t_0 - \tau r_0^2)$ such that $L(y, t_0 - \tau r_0^2) < C_2 r_0$ for some constant $C_2 = C_2(w,A) < \infty$. Observe that by (v) we have $y \in B(x_0, t_0 - \tau r_0^2, A r_0)$. So by extending an $\mathcal{L}$-geodesic between (x_1,t_1) and $(y, t_0 - \tau r_0^2)$ by a time-$(t_0 - \tau r_0^2)$ geodesic segment, we can conclude using (4.4) that there is a constant $C_3 = C_3(w,A,\tau') = C_3(w,A) < \infty$ such that $L(x_0, t_0 - (\tau + \frac{1}{2}\tau') r_0^2) < C_3 r_0$.

By the Claim, assuming $T \geq T^*(C_3)$, we find that there is a smooth minimizing $\mathcal{L}$-geodesic γ between (x_1,t_1) and $(x_0, t_0 - (\tau + \frac{1}{2}\tau')r_0^2)$ that does not hit any surgery points. We now lift γ to an $\mathcal{L}$-geodesic $\widetilde{\gamma}$ in $\widetilde{\mathcal{M}}$ starting from $(\widetilde{x}_1, t_1)$ and going backwards in time. If there are no surgery times on the time-interval $[t_0 - (\tau + \frac{1}{2}\tau')r_0^2, t_1]$, then this is trivial. If there are, then let T^i be the last surgery time which is $\leq t_1$ and lift γ on the time-interval $[T^i, t_1]$ to $\widetilde{\mathcal{M}}(T^i)$. Note that $\widetilde{\gamma}(T^i) \in \widetilde{U}^i_+$, so we can use the diffeomorphism $\widetilde{\Phi}^i$ to determine the limit $\lim_{t \nearrow T^i} \widetilde{\gamma}(t)$. Starting from this limit point, we can lift γ on the interval $[T^{i-1}, T^i)$ or $[t_0 - (\tau + \frac{1}{2}\tau')r_0^2), T^i)$ and continue the process until we reach time $t_0 - (\tau + \frac{1}{2}\tau')r_0^2$. Let $\widetilde{x}_0 = \widetilde{\gamma}(t_0 - (\tau + \frac{1}{2}\tau')r_0^2) \in \widetilde{\mathcal{M}}(t_0 - (\tau + \frac{1}{2}\tau')r_0^2)$ be the initial

point of $\widetilde{\gamma}$. Then $\widetilde{x}_0$ is a lift of x_0 and there is a $\nu_1 = \nu_1(w) > 0$ such that

$$\mathrm{vol}_{t_0-(\tau+\tau')r_0^2} B(\widetilde{x}_0, t_0 - (\tau+\tau')r_0^2, r_0) > \nu_1 r_0^3.$$

We consider now the functions $L^{\widetilde{\mathcal{M}}}, \ell^{\widetilde{\mathcal{M}}}$, the domains $D_t^{\widetilde{\mathcal{M}}}$ and the reduced volume $\widetilde{V}^{\widetilde{\mathcal{M}}}(t)$ in $\widetilde{\mathcal{M}}$ based in $(\widetilde{x}_1, t_1)$. By concatenating $\widetilde{\gamma}$ with time-$(t_0 - (\tau + \frac{1}{2}\tau')r_0^2)$ geodesic segments we conclude, using the curvature bound in (4.5), that there is some $C_4 = C_4(w, A) < \infty$ such that

$$L^{\widetilde{\mathcal{M}}}(x, t_0 - (\tau+\tau')r_0^2) < C_4 r_0 \qquad \text{for all} \qquad x \in B(\widetilde{x}_0', t_0 - (\tau+\tau')r_0^2, r_0).$$

Again, using the Claim and assuming $T \geq T^*(C_4)$, we conclude that $B(\widetilde{x}_0', t_0 - (\tau+\tau')r_0^2, r_0) \subset D^{\widetilde{\mathcal{M}}}_{t_0-(\tau+\tau')r_0^2}$. So together with the inequality $t_1 - (t_0 - (\tau+\tau')r_0^2) \geq \frac{1}{2}\tau' r_0^2$, this implies that there is some $\nu_2 = \nu_2(w, A) > 0$ such that

$$\widetilde{V}^{\widetilde{\mathcal{M}}}(t_0 - (\tau+\tau')r_0^2) > \nu_2.$$

This implies the noncollapsedness in $(\widetilde{x}_1, t_1)$.

Proof of assertion (b). The proof of this part follows along the lines of the proof of Lemma 3.10(a). The main difference is however that instead of invoking Lemma 3.6 for the non-collapsing statement, we make use of assertion (a) of this Proposition.

Observe that by (4.5), (ii) and basic volume comparison, we can choose $\kappa = \kappa(w, A) > 0$ such that the κ-noncollapsedness from assertion (a) even holds for all $t \in [t_0 - (\tau+\tau')r_0^2, t_0]$.

Let w, A be given and let $E = \max\{\underline{E}_{\widetilde{\varepsilon}_0}, E_{3.8}(\widetilde{\varepsilon}_0)\}$ and $\eta = \min\{\underline{\eta}, \eta_{3.8}\}$ where $E_{3.8}(\widetilde{\varepsilon}_0)$, $\eta_{3.8}$ are the constants from Lemma 3.8.

Assume first that the statement is false for some small $\widetilde{\rho}$, i.e. there is a time $t \in [t_0 - \tau r_0^2, t_0]$ and a point $\widetilde{x} \in \widetilde{U}(t)$ such that (x, t) does not satisfy the canonical neighborhood assumptions $CNA(\widetilde{\rho} r_0, \widetilde{\varepsilon}_0, E, \eta)$ on $\widetilde{\mathcal{M}}$. In particular $|\mathrm{Rm}|(\widetilde{x}, t) \geq \widetilde{\rho}^{-2} r_0^{-2}$.

By a point picking argument we can find a time $\overline{t} \in [t_0 - \tau r_0^2, t_0]$ and a point $\overline{x} \in \widetilde{U}(\overline{t})$ that have the same property and that additionally satisfy the following condition: Set $\overline{q} = |\mathrm{Rm}|^{-1/2}(\overline{x}, \overline{t})$. Then for any $t' \in [t_0 - (\tau+\tau')r_0^2, \overline{t}]$, all points in $\widetilde{U}(t')$ satisfy the canonical neighborhood assumptions $CNA(\frac{1}{2}\overline{q}, \widetilde{\varepsilon}_0, E, \eta)$. Observe that here we assumed that $\widetilde{\rho}^{-2} > K_1^*$ and hence by (4.5) we did not need to extend the interval $[t_0 - \tau r_0^2, t_0]$ to pick $(\overline{x}, \overline{t})$. We also get that $\mathrm{dist}_{\overline{t}}(\overline{x}, \partial\widetilde{U}(\overline{t})) > A r_0$.

We now assume that there are no uniform constants $\widetilde{\rho}$ and T such that assertion (b) holds. Then for some given w, A, we can find a sequence $\widetilde{\rho}^\alpha \to 0$ and a sequence of counterexamples $\widetilde{\mathcal{M}}^\alpha$, U^α, t_0^α, r_0^α, τ^α, θ^α, x_0^α with $t_0^\alpha \to \infty$ and $t_0^\alpha > T_{(a)}(w, A, \theta^\alpha)$ (here $T_{(a)}$ is the constant for which assertion (a) holds) such that there are times $t^\alpha \in [t_0^\alpha - \tau^\alpha (r_0^\alpha)^2, t_0^\alpha]$ and points $\widetilde{x}^\alpha \in \widetilde{U}^\alpha(t^\alpha)$ that do not satisfy the canonical neighborhood assumptions $CNA(\widetilde{\rho}^\alpha r_0^\alpha, \widetilde{\varepsilon}_0, E, \eta)$ on $\widetilde{\mathcal{M}}$. We can additionally assume that $t_0^\alpha \to \infty$. By the last paragraph, we find times $\overline{t}^\alpha \in [t_0^\alpha - \tau^\alpha (r_0^\alpha)^2, t_0^\alpha]$ and points $\overline{x}^\alpha \in \widetilde{U}(\overline{t}^\alpha)$ such that $(\overline{x}^\alpha, \overline{t}^\alpha)$ does not satisfy the canonical neighborhood assumptions $CNA(\overline{q}^\alpha, \widetilde{\varepsilon}_0, E, \eta)$ with $\overline{q}^\alpha = |\mathrm{Rm}|^{-1/2}(\overline{x}^\alpha, \overline{t}^\alpha)$, but

for any $t' \in [\overline{t}^\alpha - (\tau^\alpha + \tau')(r_0^\alpha)^2, \overline{t}^\alpha]$, all points in $\widetilde{U}^\alpha(t')$ satisfy the canonical neighborhood assumptions $CNA(\frac{1}{2}\overline{q}^\alpha, \widetilde{\varepsilon}_0, E, \eta)$.

Recall that we must have $\overline{q}^\alpha > \underline{r}_{\widetilde{\varepsilon}_0}(\overline{t}^\alpha) \geq \underline{r}_{\widetilde{\varepsilon}_0}(t_0^\alpha)$. Let $(x', t') \in \mathcal{M}^\alpha$ be a surgery point with $t' \in [t_0^\alpha - \tau^\alpha (r_0^\alpha)^2, t_0^\alpha]$. Then as in (3.2) we have by the choice of δ

$$|\mathrm{Rm}|(x', t') > c'\delta^{-2}(t') \geq c' t^2 \underline{r}_{\widetilde{\varepsilon}_0}^{-2}(2t') \geq c'(t_0^\alpha)^2 \underline{r}_{\widetilde{\varepsilon}_0}^{-2}(t_0^\alpha)$$

and hence $(\overline{q}^\alpha)^2 |\mathrm{Rm}|(x', t') > c'(t_0^\alpha)^2 \to \infty$. As in the proof of Lemma 3.10(a) we conclude using Lemma 3.5 that there is a constant $c > 0$ such that for large α the parabolic neighborhood $P(\overline{x}^\alpha, \overline{t}^\alpha, c\overline{q}^\alpha, -c(\overline{q}^\alpha)^2)$ is non-singular and we have $|\mathrm{Rm}| < 8(\overline{q}^\alpha)^{-2}$ there.

Again, as in the proof of Lemma 3.10(a), we choose $\tau^* \geq 0$ maximal with the property that for all $\tau^{**} < \tau^*$ the point $\overline{x}^\alpha$ survives until time $\overline{t}^\alpha - \tau^{**}(\overline{q}^\alpha)^2$ for infinitely many α. After passing to a subsequence, we can assume that for all $\tau^{**} < \tau^*$ the point $\overline{x}^\alpha$ survives until time $\overline{t}^\alpha - \tau^{**}(\overline{q}^\alpha)^2$ for *sufficiently large* α. Recall that $\mathrm{dist}_{\overline{t}^\alpha}(\overline{x}^\alpha, \partial \widetilde{U}^\alpha(\overline{t}^\alpha)) > A r_0^\alpha$. By (4.5) and a distance distortion estimate, we obtain that $\mathrm{dist}_t(\overline{x}^\alpha, \partial \widetilde{U}^\alpha(t)) > b r_0^\alpha$ for all $t \in [\overline{t}^\alpha - \tau^{**}(\overline{q}^\alpha)^2, \overline{t}^\alpha]$ and some $b = b(w, A) > 0$ (actually we can choose $b = b(w) > 0$). So for every $a < \infty$ and $\tau^{**} < \tau^*$, we have $\mathrm{dist}_t(\partial \widetilde{U}^\alpha(t), \overline{x}^\alpha) > a\overline{q}^\alpha$ for all $t \in [\overline{t}^\alpha - \tau^{**}(\overline{q}^\alpha)^2, \overline{t}^\alpha]$ whenever α is sufficiently large.

So by assertion (a) of this Proposition and the choice of $(\overline{x}^\alpha, \overline{t}^\alpha)$ there is a uniform constant $\kappa > 0$ such that: For all $\tau^{**} < \tau^*$, $a < \infty$ and sufficiently large α we have that for all $t \in [\overline{t}^\alpha - \tau^{**}(\overline{q}^\alpha)^2, \overline{t}^\alpha]$ the points in the ball $B(\overline{x}^\alpha, t, a\overline{q}^\alpha)$ are κ-noncollapsed on scales $< r_0^\alpha$ and satisfy the canonical neighborhood assumptions $CNA(\frac{1}{2}\overline{q}^\alpha, \widetilde{\varepsilon}_0, E, \eta)$. Therefore we can follow the reasoning of the proof of Lemma 3.10(a) and apply Lemma 3.9 to conclude that there is a $K_2^* < \infty$ such that that for all $\tau^{**} < \tau^*$ we have $(\overline{q}^\alpha)^2 |\mathrm{Rm}|(\overline{x}^\alpha, t) < K_2^*$ for all $t \in [\overline{t}^\alpha - \tau^{**}(\overline{q}^\alpha)^2, \overline{t}^\alpha]$ for infinitely many α. If $\tau^{**} < \infty$, this implies using Lemma 3.5 that there is a constant $c'' > 0$ such that $(\overline{q}^\alpha)^2 |\mathrm{Rm}|(\overline{x}^\alpha, t) < 2K_2^*$ for all $t \in [\overline{t}^\alpha - (\tau^* + c'')(\overline{q}^\alpha)^2, \overline{t}^\alpha]$ for infinitely many α. In particular, $\overline{x}^\alpha$ survives until time $\overline{t}^\alpha - (\tau^* + c'')(\overline{q}^\alpha)^2$ for infinitely many α, contradicting the choice of τ^{**}. So $\tau^* = \infty$ and again Lemma 3.9 yields that the pointed Ricci flows with surgery $(\mathcal{M}^\alpha, (\overline{x}^\alpha, \overline{t}^\alpha))$ subconverge to a κ-solution after rescaling by $(\overline{q}^\alpha)^{-1}$. Using Lemma 3.8, this yields a contradiciton to the assumption that the points $(\overline{x}^\alpha, \overline{t}^\alpha)$ don't satisfy the canonical neighborhood assumptions $CNA(\overline{q}^\alpha, \widetilde{\varepsilon}_0, E, \eta)$.

Proof of assertion (c). The proof is similar to the proof of Proposition 4.5. However, instead of using Lemma 3.10(a), we will invoke the canonical neighborhood assumptions from assertion (b), which are independent of the distance to x_0. Choose E and η according to assertion (b) and set $K = \max\{\widetilde{\rho}^{-2}(w, A), E K_1^*(w, A), 1\}$.

Note first that by (4.5) we have $|\mathrm{Rm}| < K r_0^{-2}$ on $U(t_0 - \tau r_0^2)$. Consider a time $t_1 \in [t_0 - \tau r_0^2, t_0]$ with the property that U restricted to $[t_0 - \tau r_0^2, t_1]$ is non-singular and for which

$$|\mathrm{Rm}| < 2K r_0^{-2} \qquad \text{for all} \qquad t \in [t_0 - \tau r_0^2, t_1]. \tag{4.7}$$

We will then show that we actually have

$$|\mathrm{Rm}| < Kr_0^{-2} \qquad \text{for all} \qquad t \in [t_0 - \tau r_0^2, t_1], \tag{4.8}$$

if $\overline{w}$ is chosen small enough depending on w and A. This fact will then imply assertion (c) for sufficiently large T, depending on K and θ.

So assume that U restricted to $[t_0-\tau r_0^2, t_1]$ is non-singular and that (4.7) holds. It suffices to prove the curvature bound in (4.8) for $t = t_1$. Assume that there was a point $x_1 \in U(t_1)$ with $|\mathrm{Rm}|(x_1, t_1) \geq K$. Then $x_1 \notin B(x_0, t_1, 2Ar_0)$ by (4.5). So by assumption (iv) we have

$$\mathrm{dist}_{t_1}(x_1, \partial U(t_1)) > Ar_0. \tag{4.9}$$

Using (4.7), the distance distortion estimates from Lemma 3.4(a) and assumption (v) we conclude that

$$\mathrm{dist}_{t_1}(x_1, \partial U(t_1)) < e^{4Kr_0^{-2}(t_1-t_0+\tau r_0^2)}\, \mathrm{dist}_{t_0-\tau r_0^2}(x_1, \partial U(t_0 - \tau r_0^2)) < e^{4K\tau} \cdot 2A.$$

So

$$\mathrm{dist}_{t_1}(x_0, x_1) < 2Ae^{4K\tau} + A. \tag{4.10}$$

Let $\widetilde{x}_1 \in \widetilde{U}(t_1) \subset \widetilde{\mathcal{M}}(t_1)$ be a lift of x_1. By assertion (b) we know that $(\widetilde{x}_1, t_1)$ satisfies the canonical neighborhood assumptions $CNA(\widetilde{\rho} r_0, \widetilde{\varepsilon}_0, E, \eta)$ in $\widetilde{\mathcal{M}}$. Since $|\mathrm{Rm}|(\widetilde{x}_1, t_1) \geq Kr_0^{-2} \geq (\widetilde{\rho} r_0)^{-2}$, the point $(\widetilde{x}_1, t_1)$ has a canonical neighborhood in $\widetilde{\mathcal{M}}$. Note that $|\mathrm{Rm}|(\widetilde{x}_1, t_1) \geq Kr_0^{-2} \geq EK_1^* r_0^{-2}$ and by (4.5) we have $|\mathrm{Rm}|(\widetilde{x}_0, t_1) < K_1^* r_0^{-2}$ for any lift of $\widetilde{x}_0$ in $\widetilde{\mathcal{M}}(t_1)$. So the very last case in the Definition 2.14 of the canonical neighborhood assumptions cannot occur. Therefore $(\widetilde{x}_1, t_1)$ is either the center of an ε-neck or an (ε, E)-cap. In the first case set $\widetilde{x}_2 = \widetilde{x}_1$ and in the second case let $\widetilde{x}_2 \in \widetilde{\mathcal{M}}(t_1)$ be the center of an ε-neck that bounds this cap. So in either case $(\widetilde{x}_2, t_1)$ is the center of an ε-neck in $\widetilde{\mathcal{M}}(t_1)$ and

$$\mathrm{dist}_{t_1}(\widetilde{x}_1, \widetilde{x}_2) < E|\mathrm{Rm}|^{-1/2}(\widetilde{x}_1, t_1) \leq K^{-1/2} r_0 \leq r_0$$
$$\text{and} \qquad E^{-2}Kr_0^{-2} \leq |\mathrm{Rm}|(\widetilde{x}_2, t_1) < 2E^2 K r_0^{-2}.$$

Let $x_2 \in \mathcal{M}(t_1)$ be the projection of $\widetilde{x}_2$. We can now apply Lemma 4.3 and conclude that

$$\mathrm{vol}_{t_1} B(x_2, \tfrac{1}{2}E^{-1}K^{-1/2}r_0) > \widetilde{w}_0 \cdot \tfrac{1}{8}E^{-3}K^{-3/2}r_0^3. \tag{4.11}$$

Next note that by (4.10) and the conclusion in the previous paragraph we have

$$\mathrm{dist}_{t_1}(x_0, x_2) < 2Ae^{4K\tau} + A + 1. \tag{4.12}$$

Also, using (4.9) and assuming without loss of generality that $A > 2$, we find that $B(x_2, t_1, \frac{1}{2}E^{-1}K^{-1/2}r_0) \subset U(t_1)$. Observe that by assumption (iv) any minimizing geodesic in $\mathcal{M}(t_1)$ connecting x_0 with a point in $U(t_1)$ is contained in $B(x_0, t_1, 2Ar_0) \cup U(t_1)$ and recall that by (4.5) and (4.7) we have

$$|\mathrm{Rm}| < 2Kr_0^{-2} \qquad \text{on} \qquad B(x_0, t_1, 2Ar_0) \cup U(t_1).$$

Lastly, by (4.5) there are uniform constants $\beta = \beta(w, A) > 0$ and $C_1 = C_1(w, A) < \infty$ that only depend on w and A such that

$$\mathrm{vol}_{t_1} B(x_0, t_1, \beta r_0) < C_1 \,\mathrm{vol}_{t_0} B(x_0, t_0, r_0). \tag{4.13}$$

We can now apply volume comparison together with (4.12) and (4.11) to conclude that

$$\begin{aligned}\mathrm{vol}_{t_1} B(x_0, t_1, \beta r_0) &> c_2(w, A) \frac{\beta^3}{(2Ae^{A\tau} + A + 2)^3} \,\mathrm{vol}_{t_1} B(x_1, t_1, 2Ae^{4K\tau} + A + 2) \\ &> c_2(w, A) c_3(w, A) \,\mathrm{vol}_{t_1} B(x_2, t_1, \tfrac{1}{2} E^{-1} K^{-1/2} r_0) \\ &> c_2(w, A) c_3(w, A) \widetilde{w}_0 \cdot \tfrac{1}{8} E^{-3} K^{-3/2} r_0^3.\end{aligned}$$

Here $c_2 = c_2(w, A), c_3 = c_3(w, A) > 0$ are uniform constants that only depend on w and A. Together with (4.13) and assumption (iii), this yields

$$c_2(w, A) c_3(w, A) \widetilde{w}_0 \cdot \tfrac{1}{8} E^{-3} K^{-3/2}(w, A) r_0^3 < C_1(w, A) \overline{w} r_0^3.$$

So for small enough $\overline{w}$, depending only on w and A, we obtain a contradiction.

Thus with this choice of $\overline{w}$, the bound (4.7) does indeed imply the bound (4.8). As mentioned before, this implication proves the desired result.

Proof of assertion (d). Assertion (d) follows from assertion (c) by a distance distortion estimate or from (4.10) in the previous proof. □

4.8. **Curvature control in large regions that are locally good everywhere.** We will now show that if we only have *local* goodness control within some distance to some geometrically controlled region and if we can guarantee this control on a time-interval of uniform size, then we can deduce a curvature bound which is independent of this distance.

In this section, we will use the following notion: Let $U \subset \mathcal{M}$ be a sub-Ricci flow with surgery of $\mathcal{M}$, t be a time for which $U(t)$ is defined and $d \geq 0$. Then we denote the time-t d-tubular neighborhood around $\partial U(t)$ in $U(t)$ by $B^U(\partial U, t, d) = B(\partial U(t), t, d) \cap U(t)$. The parabolic neighborhood $P^U(\partial U, t, d, \Delta t)$ is defined similarly.

Proposition 4.8. *There is a continuous positive function $\delta : [0, \infty) \to (0, \infty)$ such that for every $w, \theta > 0$ and $A < \infty$ there are constants $K = K(w, A), T(w, A, \theta) < \infty$ such that the following holds:*
Let $\mathcal{M}$ be a Ricci flow with surgery on the time-interval $[0, \infty)$ that is performed by $\delta(t)$-precise cutoff and whose time-slices are compact and let $t_0 > T$. Consider a sub-Ricci flow with surgery $U \subset \mathcal{M}$ on the time-interval $[t_0 - r_1^2, t_0]$. Let $r_1, r_0, b > 0$ be constants such that

(i) $\theta\sqrt{t_0} \leq 2r_1 < r_0 \leq \sqrt{t_0}$,
(ii) for all $x \in \partial U(t_0)$ we have $|\mathrm{Rm}| < Ar_1^{-2}$ on $P(x, t_0, r_1, -r_1^2)$,
(iii) for every $t \in [t_0 - r_1^2, t_0]$ and $x \in B^U(\partial U, t, b)$, either x is locally w-good at scale r_0 and time t or $|\mathrm{Rm}|(x, t) < Ar_1^{-2}$.

Then for every $t \in (t_0 - r_1^2, t_0]$ and $x \in B^U(\partial U, t, b)$ we have

$$|\mathrm{Rm}|(x, t) < K\big((b - \mathrm{dist}_t(\partial U(t), x))^{-2} + (t - t_0 + r_1^2)^{-1}\big).$$

Proof. Let $\delta(t)$ be an arbitrary function that goes to zero as $t \to \infty$. Then for sufficiently large t (depending on w, A and θ), we can use Definition 2.11(3) and volume comparison to conclude that no surgery point of $\mathcal{M}(t)$ is locally w-good at scale r_0 and the curvature at every surgery point satisfies $|\mathrm{Rm}| > Ar_1^{-2}$. So we can assume in the following that there are no surgery points in the space-time neighborhood

$$B = \bigcup_{t\in(t_0-r_1^2,t_0]} B^U(\partial U, t, b).$$

Consider the function

$$f \quad : \quad (x,t) \quad \longmapsto \quad |\mathrm{Rm}|(x,t)\big((b-\mathrm{dist}_t(\partial U(t),x))^{-2} + (t-t_0+r_1^2)^{-1}\big)^{-1}$$

on B. Since B is free of surgery points, we find that $|\mathrm{Rm}|$ and hence f is bounded on B (by a non-universal constant).

Denote by H the supremum of f. Choose some $(x_1,t_1) \in B$ where this supremum is attained up to a factor of 2, i.e. $f(x_1,t_1) > \frac{1}{2}H$ and set $Q = r_1^2|\mathrm{Rm}|(x_1,t_1)$. Observe that $Q > f(x_1,t_1)$. Now if $H \le \max\{2, 2A\}$, then we are done. So assume in the following that $H > \max\{2,2A\}$. This implies in particular that $Q > f(x_1,t_1) > \frac{1}{2}H > \max\{1,A\}$ and hence by assumption (iii) that the point x_1 is locally w-good at scale r_0 and time t_1. So by assumption (ii) $(x_1,t_1) \notin P(x,t_0,r_1,-r_1^2)$ for all $x \in \partial U(t_0)$.

Set $d_1 = \mathrm{dist}_{t_1}(\partial U(t_1), x_1)$, $a = r_1^{-1}(b-d_1)$ and observe that

$$Qa^2 > f(x_1,t_1) > \tfrac{1}{2}H \qquad \text{and} \qquad Q(t_1-t_0+r_1^2)r_1^{-2} > f(x_1,t_1) > \tfrac{1}{2}H. \quad (4.14)$$

For all $t \ge \frac{1}{4}(t_1-t_0+r_1^2)+t_0-r_1^2$ and $x \in B^U(\partial U, t, d_1+\frac{1}{2}ar_1)$ we have

$$\begin{aligned}|\mathrm{Rm}|(x,t) &\le H\big((b-\mathrm{dist}_t(\partial U(t),x))^{-2} + (t-t_0+r_1^2)^{-1}\big)\\ &\le H\big(4a^{-2}r_1^{-2} + 4(t_1-t_0+r_1^2)^{-1}\big) < 16Qr_1^{-2}. \quad (4.15)\end{aligned}$$

For a moment fix some arbitrary $x \in B^U(\partial U, t_1, d_1+\frac{1}{4}ar_1)$ and choose $\Delta t > 0$ maximal with the property that $t_1 - \Delta t \ge \frac{1}{4}(t_1-t_0+r_1^2)+t_0-r_1^2$ and $\mathrm{dist}_t(\partial U(t),x) < d_1 + \frac{3}{8}ar_1$ for all $t \in [t_1-\Delta t, t_1]$. We will now estimate the distance distortion between x and any point $x_0 \in \partial U$ using Lemma 3.4(b). Observe that for all $t \in [t_1-\Delta t, t_1]$ we have $|\mathrm{Rm}| < 16Qr_1^{-2}$ on $B(x,t,\frac{1}{8}ar_1)$ by (4.15). Moreover, by (4.14) we have $\frac{1}{8}Q^{-1/2}r_1 < \frac{1}{8}ar_1$. By assumption (ii) we can also find a $\beta = \beta(A) > 0$ such that $|\mathrm{Rm}| < \beta^{-2}r_1^{-2}$ on $B(x_0,t,\beta r_1)$ and such that $B(x_0,t,\beta r_1) \subset B(x_0,t_0,r_1)$ for all $t \in [t_1-\Delta t, t_1]$. So Lemma 3.4(b) yields

$$\frac{d}{dt}\,\mathrm{dist}_t(x_0,x) > -C\big(\sqrt{Q}+\beta^{-1}\big)r_1^{-1}$$

for some universal constant C and hence using (4.14) we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\Delta t \ge \min\Big\{\frac{\frac{1}{8}ar_1^2}{C(Q^{1/2}+\beta^{-1})}, \tfrac{3}{4}(t_1-t_0+r_1^2)\Big\} &> c'\min\big\{aQ^{-1/2}, a\beta, HQ^{-1}\big\}r_1^2\\ &> c\min\big\{H^{1/2}Q^{-1}, H^{1/2}Q^{-1/2}, HQ^{-1}\big\}r_1^2 = cH^{1/2}Q^{-1}r_1^2\end{aligned}$$

for some universal $c' > 0$ and some $c = c(A) > 0$. So by varying x and x_0, we conclude that $|\mathrm{Rm}| < 16Qr_1^{-2}$ on $P' = P^U(\partial U, t_1, d_1 + \frac{1}{4}ar_1, -cH^{1/2}Q^{-1}r_1^2)$ and that

$$P' \subset \bigcup_{t\in[t_1 - cH^{1/2}Q^{-1}r_1^2, t_1]} B^U(\partial U, t, d_1 + \tfrac{1}{2}ar_1).$$

By the t^{-1}-positivity of the curvature on $\mathcal{M}$, we have $\sec \geq -F(Qr_1^{-2}t_0)Qr_1^{-2}$ on P' where $F : [0,\infty) \to [0,\infty)$ is a decreasing function that goes to zero on the open end. Observe that $F(Qr_1^{-2}t_0) \leq F(4Q) \leq F(H)$ and hence we have the bound $\sec \geq -F(H)Qr_1^{-2}$ on P'. Recall now that there is a constant $0 < \beta = \beta(A) < 1$ such that $\mathrm{dist}_{t_1}(\partial U(t_1), x_1) > \beta r_1$. Then

$$P(x_1, t_1, \min\{\beta, \tfrac{1}{4}a\}r_1, -cH^{1/2}Q^{-1}r_1^2) \subset P'.$$

Define $S : (0,\infty) \to (0,\infty)$ by $S(x) = \min\{F^{-1/2}(x), \frac{1}{8}x^{1/2}, \frac{1}{2}\beta x^{1/2}, c^{1/2}x^{1/4}\}$. Then $S(x) \to \infty$ as $x \to \infty$ and we find using (4.14):

$$\begin{aligned} \tfrac{1}{4}a > \tfrac{1}{8}H^{1/2}Q^{-1/2} &\geq S(H)Q^{-1/2}, \\ \beta \geq \tfrac{1}{2}\beta H^{1/2}Q^{-1/2} &\geq S(H)Q^{-1/2}, \\ cH^{1/2}Q^{-1} &\geq S^2(H)Q^{-1}. \end{aligned}$$

This yields the bound

$$\sec \geq -S^{-2}(H)Qr_1^{-2} \qquad \text{on} \qquad P(x_1, t_1, S(H)Q^{-1/2}r_1, -S^2(H)Q^{-1}r_1^2).$$

In particular $\rho_{r_0}(x_1, t_1) \geq S(H)Q^{-1/2}r_1$ (observe that $S(H)Q^{-1/2}r_1 \leq \beta r_1 \leq r_0$).

So by property (iii), we conclude that for $r = S(H)Q^{-1/2}r_1$ we have $\mathrm{vol}_{t_1} \widetilde{B}(\widetilde{x}_1, t_1, r) > \widetilde{c}wr^3$, where $\widetilde{B}(\widetilde{x}_1, t_1, r)$ denotes the universal cover of the ball $B(x_1, t_1, r)$. We can now lift the flow on $P(x_1, t_1, r, -r^2)$ to this universal cover, rescale it by r^{-1} and use Lemma 3.11 to conclude

$$Qr_1^{-2} = |\mathrm{Rm}|(x_1, t_1) < K_0(\widetilde{c}w)\tau_0^{-1}(\widetilde{c}w)r^{-2} = K_0\tau_0^{-1}S^{-2}(H)Qr_1^{-2}.$$

This implies $S^2(H) < K_0\tau_0$ and hence H is bounded by some universal constant $H_0 = H_0(w, A) < \infty$. This finishes the proof. □

References

[Bam1] R. Bamler, "Ricci flow with surgery", diploma thesis, Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität Munich (2007)

[Bam0] R. Bamler, "Long-time behavior of 3 dimensional Ricci flow, Introduction"

[BamD] R. Bamler, "Long-time behavior of 3 dimensional Ricci flow, D: Proof of the main results"

[BBBMP1] L. Bessières, G. Besson, M. Boileau, S. Maillot, J. Porti, "Geometrisation of 3-Manifolds", Zuerich, Switzerland: European Mathematical Society Publishing House, (2010), http://www.ems-ph.org/books/book.php?proj_nr=122

[Cetal] B. Chow et al, "The Ricci flow: techniques and applications. Part I", 135, xxiv-536 (American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2007).

[Ham] R. Hamilton, "Non-singular solutions of the Ricci flow on three-manifolds", Communications in Analysis and Geometry 7, no. 4 (1999): 695-729

[KL1] B. Kleiner, J. Lott, "Notes on Perelman's papers", Geom. Topol. 12, no. 5 (2008): 2587-2855

[MT1] J. W. Morgan, G. Tian, "Ricci Flow and the Poincare Conjecture", American Mathematical Society, (2007)

[Per1] G. Perelman, "The entropy formula for the Ricci flow and its geometric applications", math/0211159 (November 2002): 39

[Per2] G. Perelman, "Ricci flow with surgery on three-manifolds", arXiv:math/0303109 (March 10, 2003), http://arxiv.org/abs/math/0303109

UC Berkeley, Department of Mathematics, 970 Evans Hall, Berkeley, CA 94720, USA

E-mail address: rbamler@math.berkeley.edu